J. Jones Fecit.

LOUIS XVI.

King of the French.

Restorer of their Liberties.

Published as the Act directs June 1st 1791 by T. Hookham.

THE DEFENCE OF LOUIS XVI.

AS DELIVERED AT THE BAR OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION,

Wednesday, 26th December, 1792,

BY DE SEZE, ONE OF HIS COUNSEL.

As published at Paris by order of the Convention.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

SOME REFLECTIONS ON A LATE *MELANCHOLY EVENT*; WITH THE WILL OF HIS LATE MAJESTY.

LONDON:
Printed for HOOKHAM and CARPENTER, Bond-ſtreet.
1793.

OBLIGED to write ſo important a defence in four nights, whilſt the days were employed with my colleagues in examining the numerous papers of which we were permitted the ſight; it will be unneceſſary for me to ſay, that the defence itſelf will ſhew the precipitation with which it is done, and that it offers, in many reſpects, the reſult of things rather than their cauſes. But I had a ſacred duty to fulfil; and in performing it, I conſulted only my zeal, not my powers.

DEFENCE

OF

LOUIS XVI.

Citizens, Repreſentatives of the Nation,

THE moment is then arrived, when Louis, accuſed in the name of the French people, can be heard among them! that moment is arrived, when, ſurrounded by his counſel, which humanity and the laws have granted him, he can preſent to the nation a defence, which his heart does not diſavow, and develope thoſe intentions which have always directed him! I already ſee, by the ſilence which reigns around me, that the day of juſtice has ſucceeded to that of violence and prejudice; that this ſolemn act is not a vain form; that the temple of liberty is likewiſe that of impartiality; where the laws com-

mand, and that the man, whoever he is, reduced to the fallen ſtate of an accuſed perſon, may be aſſured to find an intereſt even in thoſe who are his proſecutors—I ſay a man, whoever he is; for Louis is at preſent only an individual, and an impeached one; he has no longer any power to exerciſe; he can no longer impreſs fears, or offer hopes; but as ſuch, he is the more entitled, not only to your juſtice, but, your favour: and all the commiſeration to which misfortunes of ſuch high magnitude can give birth, he has a right to inſpire:—and if, as a celebrated Republican has ſaid, "the misfortunes of kings, to "thoſe who have ever lived in monarchical govern-"ments, have ſomething in them much more affect-"ing and ſacred than thoſe of other men," no doubt the fate of him who filled the firſt throne in the univerſe will excite a more lively intereſt; and that intereſt ought to increaſe in proportion as the moment approaches when you are going to decide upon his fate. Hitherto you have only heard his own anſwers. You called him among you, and he came with all the ſerenity and courage which marks his character; he came, ſtrong in his innocence, and the purity of his intentions, from which conſoling teſtimonies no human power can deprive him. Supported and confirmed indeed by his whole life and conduct, he laid open to you every ſecret of his ſoul; he wiſhed that you ſhould know, and, through you, the nation, all that he ever did: he revealed to you his inmoſt thoughts; but in anſwering you thus, at the

moment

moment when he was called before you; in diſcuſſing without any preparation, or examining the accuſations which he did not foreſee, and in providing, as it may be ſaid, for a juſtification, which he was far from ſuppoſing he ſhould ever have occaſion for, Louis could only tell you of his innocence, he could not convince you, he could not bring with him the proofs of it—that, Citizens, remains for me to do; I bring to you thoſe proofs, and bring them to that people, in whoſe name he is impeached. I could wiſh, in this moment, to be heard by all France, that this ſpace in a moment could be ſo enlarged as to receive every Frenchman.—But I know, that, in ſpeaking to the Repreſentatives of the Nation, it is to the nation itſelf I ſpeak; ſtill it may be allowed, that Louis ſhould feel ſome regret that the great multitude of citizens, who have received impreſſions againſt him, cannot now be preſent to judge of what we can produce to refute the accuſations laid to his charge. His greateſt concern, however, is, to prove his innocence; and to this alone all his thoughts tend!

Louis knows, that Europe waits with anxiety for the judgement you ſhall pronounce; but it is France alone he thinks of. He knows well, that poſterity will carefully collect one day all that ſhall relate to this important diſcuſſion; but Louis thinks only of his contemporaries, and aſpires only to undeceive them. We, too, are only ambitious to defend him. We likewiſe will forget that other nations are liſtening to us, that poſterity will record us, that opi-

nions are already preparing; we only look to the preſent moment; we are occupied only with the fate of Louis; and we ſhall think we have wholly fulfilled our taſk in proving his innocence.

I cannot, however, conceal from you, Citizens, as a cauſe of the utmoſt concern, that time has been ſo wanting to us all, but more particularly to myſelf, for the combining and arranging this defence. Numberleſs were the materials put into our hands, but ſcarce had we the time to caſt our eyes over them; and thoſe very moments granted us to diſcuſs the articles which the commiſſioners oppoſed to us, was obliged to be employed in merely arranging them: the neceſſity of frequent interviews too with the accuſed, deprived me of time which ſhould have been deſtined to the digeſting them; and in a cauſe which, for its importance and ſolemnity, both preſent and future, would have merited the reflection and efforts of many months, I had not eight days allowed me. I intreat you, therefore, Citizens, to hear me with the indulgence with which our reſpect for your decree ought to enſure us. Let not, then, the cauſe of Louis ſuffer from the unavoidable omiſſions of his defenders. Let your juſtice aſſiſt our zeal, and that it may be ſaid, in the fine expreſſion of the Roman orator, "that you have yourſelves "worked with me to ſupport the defence of the ac-"cuſed."

I have

I have a great career to run through; but I ſhall ſhorten its extent, by dividing it.

If I ſpoke only to men of the law, I ſhould ſpeak only of the law; and it would be ſufficient to ſay, that ſince the nation has aboliſhed royalty, there is nothing more to be pronounced upon Louis; but I ſpeak likewiſe to the people; and Louis has too much at heart the wiſh of removing thoſe prejudices with which they have been inſpired, not to impoſe an additional taſk on himſelf, and conſider as a duty incumbent on him, to examine every diſtinct charge brought againſt him.

I ſhall firſt, then, lay down the different charges, and then diſcuſs the points contained in them.

Articles relative to the Inviolability of the King, as decreed by the Conſtitutions.

I muſt examine theſe points in two ways; firſt, as Louis was ſituated before royalty was aboliſhed, and, 2dly, as he has been ſince that period.

On entering upon this diſcuſſion, I find, in the firſt place, the decree by which the National Convention decided that Louis ſhould be tried by the Convention; nor am I ignorant of the abuſe that ſome perſons, more enthuſiaſtic, perhaps, than reaſonable, have endeavoured to make of this decree. I know that they ſuppoſed by this decree the Convention

vention had thereby taken from Louis that inviolability which the conſtitution had granted him, and that, conſequently, Louis could no longer bring that inviolability to his defence.

But this is an error which the moſt ſimple obſervation will be ſufficient to refute.

What was it that the Convention did pronounce?

In decreeing that Louis ſhould be judged by them, all that they decided was, that they conſtituted themſelves judges of the accuſations which they themſelves had opened againſt him; but, at the ſame time, ordered that Louis ſhould be heard; and he certainly could not be judged before he was heard.

If, then, Louis was to be heard before judgement was given, he has the right of defending himſelf againſt the accuſations he is charged with by every means which appears to him the moſt proper to confute them. This is a privilege which every impeached perſon has an equal right to: it belongs to them in quality of accuſed; nor is it in the power of the judge to deprive him of any lawful means of defence; he can only, when giving his judgement, eſtimate the merits of them. The Convention itſelf, then, has only that power with regard to Louis; they will judge the defence when they have heard it. If Louis is wrong in the points which he thinks it important he ſhould avail himſelf of, it will be the part of the Convention to diſcard them in their deciſion;

ciſion; but it is neceſſary they ſhould be heard; and common juſtice demands it.

Here are then the principles which I lay down, and upon which I argue.

The will of the nation is the ſovereign will; it has the power to adopt that mode and form of government which appears moſt ſuitable; and ſtill more for a nation, after experiencing the defect of the government adopted, is free to make any alteration to its own benefit, even by changing to another.

I do not diſpute this right of nations, it is impreſcriptible; it is written in our conſtitutional act; and it is perhaps not forgotten, that it is owing to the efforts of one of the Counſel of Louis, then a member of the Aſſembly, that France has this fundamental maxim among her laws at this day.

But a great nation cannot itſelf exerciſe its ſovereignty, it muſt neceſſarily be delegated. The neceſſity of this delegation leads to the election of a king, or that of forming itſelf into a republic.

In 1789, at that firſt epoch of the Revolution which changed at once the form of government under which we had lived ſo many centuries, the nation aſſembled, declared to the proxies they had choſen, that they would have a monarchical government.

And a monarchical government renders it neceſſary that the head of that government ſhould be conſidered as inviolable.

The

The Repreſentatives of the French nation thought that in a country where the king was alone entruſted with the execution of the laws, it was neceſſary, in order to prevent and ſurmount thoſe obſtacles which would impede the execution of them, and that he might be enabled to command that reſpect which makes obedience loved, and that he ſhould be able to keep within their proper bounds all the ſecondary powers, which are ever aiming to depart from it, and exceed their juſt limits; that he ſhould repreſs and prevent the evil-minded, who were ever oppoſing the general good; that he ſhould anxiouſly watch over every department of the ſtate; in a word, that all the ſprings of government ſhould at all times be ready to act their proper part for the ſervice and benefit of the people, it was thought, that to fulfil ſuch high and important duties, it was neceſſary the monarch ſhould enjoy a great ſhare of power, and that that power might be fully exerciſed, that he muſt be made inviolable. The Repreſentatives of the nation know too, that it was not for kings ſo much they created that inviolability as for themſelves, for their own ſafety and happineſs, and becauſe that in monarchical governments the internal peace would be for ever troubled, unleſs the chief of the ſupreme power did not at all times hold up the inflexibility of the laws to counteract the views of thoſe who wiſhed to violate them.

They conſidered, too, as a principle both juſt and political, the maxims of a neighbouring people, " that the faults of kings can never be perſonal; " that from the dangers of their ſituation, the temp- " tations which ſurround them, and the very faults " they commit, ſhould rather be conſidered as the " actions of others than themſelves; and that it was " better for the people themſelves, whoſe real " power conſiſted in that inviolability, to take away " all kind of reſponſibility from them, and rather " ſupport their errors than to expoſe them to at- " tacks, which could only excite great revolutions."

It is with theſe ideas that the Repreſentatives of the people laid the foundation of that conſtitution demanded by all France.

I then open the acts of the conſtitution, and there find, in the firſt chapter upon royalty, that royalty is indiviſible, and delegated hereditary to the reigning race in the male line.

From which I obſerve, that the title which decrees royalty to Louis is a delegation.

The nature of this delegation was next a queſtion.

They aſk if it was a contract, and particularly if it was a ſynallagmatical one?

But theſe are only definitions upon words.

Certainly this delegation was not a contract of the nature of thoſe which cannot be diſſolved but by the mutual conſent of parties; it is evident that it was only a mandate, an attribution of the exerciſe of the ſovereign power, the principles of which the nation re-

ſerved to itſelf, and which it could not alienate, and conſequently an attribution revocable in its nature, as all mandates are; it was a contract of that kind, that while it ſubſiſted, and not revoked, obligated the party who gives it to fulfil the conditions under which it was given, as, on the other hand, it binds him who receives it to fulfil, on his part, all that is therein preſcribed.

Let us now leave theſe definitions, which affect only words, and firſt ſtate the conſtitutional act, which ſubmitting Louis to the faithfully fulfilling of theſe auguſt functions which the nation had inveſted him with, could not exact from him other conditions, or ſubject him to other penalties than thoſe expreſſed in the mandate itſelf.

I paſs to the ſecond article, and there read, that "*the perſon of the king is inviolable and ſacred,*" and that inviolability is there ſtated in an abſolute manner. There is no condition annexed, no exception that alters or weakens it; it is expreſſed in two words, and thoſe of the plaineſt kind.

But here follows the hypotheſis foreſeen by the conſtitution, and which, without altering the king's inviolability, ſince it reſpects his character of king, while he is ſuch, ſuppoſe circumſtances, in which he can loſe that character, and ceaſe to be a king.

The firſt of theſe articles is as follows:

"If on one month after the invitation of the le-
"giſlative body, the king has not taken this oath,
"that he will be faithful to the nation and the law,

" and to maintain the conſtitution : or that, after ha-
" ving taken the oath, he ſhould retract it, he will
" be conſidered as having abdicated the throne."

The nation here impoſes on the king the obligation of taking the oath of fidelity, and that of keeping to his oath.

To retract his oath is certainly a crime againſt the nation. The conſtitution foreſaw this crime: And what is the puniſhment it pronounces ?—" that
" it will be preſumed the king has abdicated the
" throne."

I expreſs myſelf ill when I call it puniſhment; for in truth it is not a puniſhment which the law pronounces, in the right ſenſe of this word; it is not a judgement that it ordains; it is not a forfeiture that it eſtabliſhes; the word is not once mentioned in the law; it is merely a ſuppoſition laid down, by which it declares, that in ſuch a caſe the king ſhall be preſumed to have abdicated the crown.

The wording in this part is of importance.

From reſpect to the character of the king, the conſtitution wiſhed to avoid, even in the expreſſion, any term that might wound his feelings. You find, there was no tribunal created, no judgement ſpoken of, that the word forfeiture is not mentioned; but, for the ſafety of the conſtitution, it was thought right to provide againſt any attempts or treachery on the part of the king; and the conſtitution ſays, in caſe this ſhould happen, the king will be pre-

ſumed to give his conſent to revoking the mandate given by us, and we become free to recal it.

I am ſenſible that this preſumed revocation muſt be declared; and though the conſtitution is ſilent, as to the mode in which that declaration ſhould take place, it is evidently to the nation which belongs the right of pronouncing it; but after all, this is only a ſuppoſition to be realiſed, and, properly ſpeaking, is not a penalty, it is a circumſtance.

I have juſt ſaid that the conſtitution foreſaw the caſe, where the King would retract his oath of fidelity; but without retracting he could betray it; he could make attempts againſt the ſafety of the nation; he could turn againſt it, that power which was given him for its defence.

And the conſtitution, in providing againſt this fault, What does it pronounce?

It ſays, at the ſixth article,

" If the King puts himſelf at the head of an army, " or directs any forces againſt the nation, or does " not oppoſe by an act in form ſuch enterprizes, " carried on in his name, he will be conſidered as " having abdicated the throne."

I entreat you, citizens, to remark well the meaning of this crime foreſeen by the law:

" To put himſelf at the head of an army, and " direct forces againſt the nation."

Certainly there cannot exiſt a more capital crime than this, it includes every other: in this is underſtood

ſtood all the combinations which muſt precede ſuch an event; all the perfidious machinations and plots, which ſuch an enterprize demands; and in its conſequences all the horrors and calamities which a bloody and inteſtine war brings with it.—Nevertheleſs, what is it the conſtitution pronounces?—the preſumption of abdication.

The ſeventh article guards againſt the circumſtance of the King's leaving the kingdom, and, upon an invitation from the Legiſlative body, to return in the ſpace of time fixed, if he ſhould refuſe to comply with it, it will then be conſidered as an abdication.

Finally, at the eighth article, (and which is a very important one) it ſtates, " That after abdication, " either expreſs or legal, the king will be conſidered " among the claſs of citizens, and may be impeached " and judged as ſuch for the acts poſterior to his " abdication."

It is not neceſſary to define what the expreſs abdication is.—And the legal abdication explains itſelf in the articles I have quoted.

The reſult then, from this is, that it is only after having abdicated voluntarily, or having committed one of the crimes which carries with it the preſumption of abdication, that the king enters into the claſs of citizens.

The King was not then before this, conſidered as one of this claſs.

He

He had then a conſtitutional exiſtence, abſolutely diſtinct and different from every other citizen; and from whence came this particular and privileged exiſtence, if not from the law, which had ſtamped on him a ſacred character of inviolability, which could not be effaced till after his expreſs or legal abdication?

And obſerve, that the law, which ſays, that the King enters into the claſs of citizens, after abdication, made that abdication the reſult of what?— the greateſt of crimes which a king can poſſibly be guilty of to the nation; that of conducting an army againſt it, to ſubdue and enſlave it; and after this atrocious act, the law declares, *that he becomes a ſimple citizen*; it is not then ſuppoſed, that was he even taken in the very act, the King could loſe his life; it does not even ſeem he could be condemned or puniſhed in any way; as if he could never experience any other than that of abdication.

Citizens, how greatly do theſe articles of the conſtitutional law, thus brought together, explain each other: and what light do they not throw on the queſtion now before us?

But I continue.—

The king, becoming like another citizen, can then be judged like them.

But for what acts?

For acts poſterior to his abdication.

For

For acts anterior to his abdication he cannot be judged, according to the uſual ſenſe of the expreſſion.

All that can be applied to this act is, the preſumption of the abdication itſelf.

This is all that the conſtitution meant, and there is no departing from it.

Beſides, the law here is perfectly equal between the legiſlature and the king.

The legiſlative body could likewiſe betray the nation; it could abuſe the power it was entruſted with; it could prolong that power beyond the term fixed; it could invade its own ſovereignty. The nation, no doubt, would have the right to diſſolve this body; but no puniſhment was pronounced by the conſtitution againſt it, neither ſeparately on its members, nor collectively as a body.

I now come to make the application of theſe principles.

Louis is accuſed, and that in the name of the nation: he is accuſed of ſeveral crimes. Now theſe crimes are guarded againſt by the conſtitution, or they are not.

If they are not, you cannot judge them, as there exiſts no law which can be applied; and you know it is one of the moſt ſacred rights of man, to be judged only by thoſe laws exiſting before the crime committed.

If they are included in the conſtitutional act, Louis, in that caſe, has incurred only the preſumption of abdication.

But I go further, and ſay, that they are included and provided againſt in the conſtitutional act; for that act mentions the moſt atrocious of all, and which includes every other; that of making war with the nation, and turning its own forces againſt it. In whatever ſenſe it is underſtood, all reſts there. Every perfidy which Louis could poſſibly be guilty of, in the intention of overturning that conſtitution which he had promiſed to maintain, can be only conſidered in the ſenſe of making war with the nation; and that taken in a figurative ſenſe, is a war ſtill leſs terrible, than maſſacres, conflagrations, and all the devaſtation which, in a literal ſenſe, war brings with it. And yet, for all theſe crimes, the law pronounces only abdication.

I know that, as the nation has now aboliſhed royalty, it cannot pronounce that abdication.—The nation, no doubt, poſſeſſed that right.

It had the power of changing the government of France. But has it the power of changing the fate of Louis?

Had it the power to prevent Louis from appealing to thoſe laws to which he had ſubmitted? Had it the right to go beyond that mandate by which he was bound?

And Louis, has he not the right to ſay, When the Convention formed itſelf, I was at that time a priſoner to the nation? You could then have decided on my fate, as you are now going to do.—Why did you not?

You have aboliſhed royalty: I do not diſpute your right of doing it; but if you had ſuſpended that declaration of the national will, and that you had begun by accuſing and judging me, you could then have inflicted no other puniſhment than that of abdication.

Why then did you not begin by this?

What you have done, could it take away the rights I poſſeſſed!

Could you, yourſelves, thus depart from the conſtitution, and then bring as a charge againſt me that it was aboliſhed? You would puniſh me, and, becauſe you have annihilated that conſtitution, you will deprive me of the fruit of it. You would puniſh me; and, becauſe you cannot find a puniſhment which you have a right to inflict on me, you will make one different from that which I acknowledged, and that one expreſsly for me!

At this time there is certainly no exiſting power equal to yours; but there is one, which you have not,---that of being unjuſt.

Citizens, I can find no reply to this defence: nevertheleſs, there has been ſome made, however.

They ſay that the nation could not, without taking away its ſovereignty, give up the right of puniſhing

crimes againſt the conſtitution, otherwiſe than by the penalties ordained by the conſtitution.——But this is an equivocation that we are aſtoniſhed ſhould be admitted.

The nation could adopt a conſtitutional law.—She could not renounce the right of changing that law, becauſe this right was the eſſence of the ſovereignty which belongs to it; but it could not ſay, (without raiſing the aſtoniſhment and indignation of the whole world) I will not execute the laws which I have myſelf made, notwithſtanding the ſolemn oath I took to execute them while they ſubſiſted.—To ſuppoſe ſuch language, would be to inſult national loyalty; and to make us conclude, that for the repreſentatives of the French people the conſtitution has been the worſt of ſnares.

They ſay, too, that if the miſdemeanors, of which Louis was accuſed, were not in the conſtitutional act, all that could be concluded, is, that he ſhould either be judged upon the principles of natural or civil right.

To this I reply, firſt,—That it would be ſtrange indeed, that the King ſhould not enjoy the privilege which the law grants to every citizen; which is that of being judged by the law only, and not by any arbitrary judgement.

2dly, That it is an untruth to aſſert, that the faults, of which Louis is accuſed, are not included in the the conſtitutional act.

What

What is it that he is accuſed of? Is it not of betraying the nation, in co-operating and favouring enterprizes, which may have been attempted to overthrow the conſtitution?

Now this charge evidently comes under the head of the 6th article, in the caſe of the King's not oppoſing any enterprize carried on in his name. But of the crime under the firſt head of the ſame article, which is that of a war made againſt the nation at the head of an army, and which is much more weighty than the ſecond, if that is only puniſhed with abdication of royalty, how can a ſeverer puniſhment be inflicted for a fault of leſs magnitude?

I ſeek every ſpecious objection that can be made, and wiſh I could go over them all more minutely. I do not think it neceſſary to ſpeak of that which ſays, that Louis had been conſidered as in the act of inſurrection. Both reaſon and juſtice are equally averſe to the diſcuſſion of a maxim deſtructive of all juſtice and liberty; a maxim which endangers the life and honor of every citizen, and which is in itſelf quite contrary to the nature of an inſurrection.

Without examining the circumſtance which muſt diſtinguiſh legitimate inſurrections from that which is not ſo; national inſurrections from partial ones; I may obſerve, that the very nature of an inſurrection is, a reſiſtance both ſudden and violent, to an oppreſſion which we think is offered to us, and that from this very reaſon it cannot be an act of reflection, conſequently not a judgement. In a na-

tion which has a conſtitutional law, whatever it may be, an inſurrection can only be an appeal to that law, and call for judgement, founded on the ordinances it has conſecrated.

In a word, that every conſtitution, republican or other, which has not this foundation, and which ſhould give to an inſurrection alone, of whatever nature it may be, it is of little matter, or whatever its aim may be; to give it, I ſay, that ſtamp, or thoſe marks which belong only to the law itſelf, ſuch an unſtable edifice muſt be thrown down by the firſt prevailing wind.

I ſhall not ſpeak upon that opinion neither, which declares, that royalty is a crime, becauſe it is an uſurpation: for the crime here would be on the part of the nation, who ſhould ſay openly,—I offer you royalty; and, ſecretly,—I will puniſh you for having received it.

It is objected, that Louis could not appeal to the conſtitutional law, ſince he had violated it.

It is ſuppoſed he violated that law; but it is eaſily proved that he did not.

But, further, the conſtitutional law provided itſelf againſt this violation, and pronounced no other penalty than that of abdication.

It is ſaid, that Louis ſhould be judged as an enemy.

But is he not an enemy, who puts himſelf at the head of an army againſt his own nation? and nevertheleſs, we muſt repeat, ſince it ſeems to be for-

forgotten, that the conſtitution provided for this, and fixed the penalty.

They ſay, that the king was inviolable only to citizens, individually ; but that had no relation with the people at large.—But in this caſe, the Republican Functionaries could not themſelves claim the protection which the law gives to them.

The repreſentatives of the nation would then be no longer inviolable againſt the people, for what they might have done in quality of repreſentatives.—What an inconceivable ſyſtem !

It is ſaid again, that there exiſted no law which could be applied to Louis; and that it muſt be, *The will of the people* in its place. Citizens, my anſwer here is this, in the words of Rouſſeau, " Where " I find no law that ſhould be followed, nor a judge " that ought to pronounce it, I cannot appeal to " the general will ; the public will, as a general one, " can neither give judgement on a man, nor on a " fact."* Such a text has no need of comment.

I ſhall now cloſe this long train of the different objections, which I have collected from all the opinions publiſhed, and which, as it appears, does not deſtroy the principles upon which I argue.

And after all, it appears to me, that all which has been ſaid, or can be ſaid, againſt the inviolability declared in the Conſtitutional Act, that there are only the two following concluſions which can be

* Social Contract, article IV. by Rouſſeau.

drawn:

drawn : either that the law ſhould not be underſtood in the abſolute ſenſe it appears, or that it ſhould not be executed as ſuch.

Now, in the firſt caſe, I ſhall ſay, that in 1789, when this law was diſcuſſed in the aſſembly, all the doubts, objections, and difficulties, were offered, which are at this time renewed : this is a fact, well known upon record, and cannot be conteſted ; nevertheleſs, the law was adopted, ſuch as it is now written in the Conſtitutional Act.

But it cannot be underſtood at this day, in any other ſenſe than that it appears. We cannot, then, admit of any definitions, which change or counteract the intention of this law ; nor bring the abſolute inviolability it pronounces to a relative or modified one.

I reply to the ſecond point, that the law of inviolability, was it even unreaſonably abſurd, contrary to the national liberty, ſtill it muſt be executed till it was revoked, becauſe the nation accepted it in accepting the conſtitution ; becauſe in accepting it, it juſtified its repreſentatives of the errors they were reproached with ; and laſtly,, becauſe, and which admits of no objection, the nation ſwore to execute it while it exiſted.

The nation can, no doubt, at this day declare, that they will no longer have a monarchical government ; ſince it is impoſſible that this form of government can ſubſiſt without the inviolability of its chiefs ; they can renounce to this government, be-

cauſe

cauſe of that very inviolability; but they cannot efface it whilſt Louis filled the throne.

Louis was inviolable as he was a king; the abolition of royalty can effect no change in the condition of the accuſed; all that reſults is, that they can no longer inflict on him any puniſhment but abdication.

We may then draw this concluſion, that where there is no law which can be applied, there can be no judgements; and where there can be no judgement there can be no condemnation pronounced.

I mention condemnation, but remember, that if you take from Louis his inviolability as a king, you owe him at leaſt the rights of a citizen; for you cannot ſo ordain it, that Louis ceaſes to be a king when you declare you will judge him as ſuch, and that he becomes one at the moment of the judgement which you will pronounce.

If, however, you meant to judge him as a citizen, I ſhould aſk you where are thoſe forms as a ſecurity and protection, which every citizen has the indiſputable right to claim?—Where is that diviſion of powers, without which there can be no juſtice nor liberty?

I ſhould aſk you, Where are thoſe juries, thoſe hoſtages granted by the law to citizens, as the guarantee of their ſafety and innocence?—Where is that neceſſary privilege of appeal, placed as a defence againſt hatred and violence?—that appeal to

the majority, ſo wiſely eſtabliſhed in favor of the accuſed?

I ſhould ſay, Where is that ſilent ſcrutiny, which admoniſhes the judge to collect his thoughts, to retire within himſelf, before he pronounces, there to weigh both facts and opinions?

In a word, Where are thoſe ſacred precautions which the laws have adopted, That a citizen, though guilty, ſhould never fall but from its dictates?—Citizens, I ſpeak here the language of a Free Man; I wiſh to find judges among you, and I ſee only accuſers!

You mean to decide on the fate of Louis, and it is you who accuſe him!

You ſit in judgement upon him, and you, yourſelves, have broken your vows!

You mean to judge him, and you have publiſhed your intentions throughout Europe.

Louis will then be the only Frenchman, for whom no law exiſts!—He will be allowed neither the rights of Citizen, nor the prerogative of King. He will be conſidered neither in his former ſtate, nor in his preſent one!—What a ſtrange and inconceivable deſtiny is this!

But I will not inſiſt farther upon theſe reflections; I leave them to your conſcience: nor ſhall I defend Louis only upon principles; I will combat, too, the prejudices which have been raiſed againſt his intentions, and againſt himſelf; I will remove them, by pre-

preſenting you with his juſtification, and examine each article which the Act of Accuſation announces.

Which I ſhall divide into two parts.

And, firſt, the facts which preceded the conſtitution and afterwards thoſe which followed it.

Diſcuſſion of Facts anterior to the Acceptance of the Conſtitution.

You go back, Citizens, in your act to the month of June 1789, I ſhall likewiſe.

How is it that you could think of accuſing him for having wiſhed, on the 20th of June 1789, to diſſolve the aſſembly of the Repreſentatives of the nation? Surely you forget that it was he that had convoked it.

Do you forget, that for theſe 150 years back, princes, more jealous of their power than he was, conſtantly refuſed convoking them? that he alone had the courage to do it? that he alone dared to be enlightened, to liſten to the addreſſes of his people, and dreaded not their claims?

Do you forget the ſacrifices that he made before he convoked the nation? All that he took from his own power to add to ours; that lively ſatisfaction which he teſtified at ſeeing us enjoy the valuable bleſſings of freedom, which he had himſelf granted us?

Citizens, we are at this time too far diſtant from that moment; we have effaced it from our minds;

and forget what the ſtate of France was in 1787; upon that power which uncontrouled authority then exerciſed; all the reſpect and fears it created; we do not recollect that it was only to the generous intentions and acts of a prince, againſt whom ſo many voices are now raiſed, that we are indebted for the nation's being firſt aſſembled: And can you think that the ſame man, who ſpontaneouſly did this act, at once ſo noble and courageous, could, a month after, have intentions ſo oppoſite?

You reproach him with the diſturbances of the month of July, and the troops quartered round Paris.

Louis has proved very clearly his innocence upon this head.

I can aſſert, that the troops quartered round Paris were ordered there only to defend Paris; that, far from having been commanded to oppoſe the citizens, they were ordered not to fire upon them: this order I ſaw myſelf, when I defended the general * of theſe troops, who was accuſed of treaſon againſt the nation, and which the nation did not heſitate to acquit him of.

But I have a ſtill better reply than this to make, and it is the nation itſelf that furniſhed me with it.

Upon the 4th of Auguſt following, the whole nation proclaims Louis the *Reſtorer of French liberty*, aſks him to unite with them, and offer together to

* Bezenval.

the

the Supreme Being their vows of mutual gratitude, and voted a medal to perpetuate for ever this great epocha.

I ſee now no remains, no veſtiges of the month of July.

You reproach him with the Flanders regiment being brought to Verſailles.

The municipal officers had made the demand.

And next you ſpeak of the inſult offered to the national cockade.

To this Louis has told you himſelf, that if it was ſo, he was ignorant of it, and that it did not paſs in his preſence.

His obſervations on the decrees of the 11th of Auguſt, was it not his conſcience that dictated them? And why had he not then the liberty of offering his opinion, ſince the nation afterwards gave him the right of oppoſing the decrees?

You reproach him with the events of the 5th and 6th of October.

Citizens, there can be but one reply proper for Louis to make on this ſubject, which is, not to recal thoſe events.

I have much greater pleaſure in retracing to you the noble conduct of Louis to the National Aſſembly, and that of the National Aſſembly on the 4th of February towards Louis.

I like better to recal to you, that in July following, the Repreſentatives of the people conſtituted Louis the Chief of the National Federation: ſuch a

mark of public confidence ſhews plainly the opinion they entertained of him.

You ſay, that ſince the federation Louis endeavoured to corrupt the minds of the public; that there have been found in his beaureau memoirs, in which Talon was repreſented as deſtined to act in Paris, and Mirabeau in the provinces, to ſtir up a counter revolution; that letters likewiſe had been found of the Miniſter in the department of the civil liſt, which ſpeaks of money diſperſed, and mentions that this money had produced no effect.

You bring theſe letters and memoirs againſt him.

But to this charge, Citizens, I have more than one reply to make.

And, firſt, if I was now defending the cauſe of any other, I ſhould ſay, that papers that could only be obtained by the means of forcing a man's habitation, could not be brought in evidence againſt him.

I ſhould obſerve, ſecondly, that when the ſeal of juſtice is put on papers and effects of any one, the inventory of thoſe things are always taken in the preſence of the perſon accuſed, otherwiſe nothing could be eaſier for enemies to introduce fabricated papers, hurtful to the priſoner, and, on the other hand, to take away thoſe which might aid and prove his juſtification. In a word, without this precaution of the preſence of the perſon accuſed, in making the inventory of the things ſeized upon in his dwelling, the honeſt man would every day be expoſed both in character and liberty.

As the law allows this to every citizen, I have the ſame right, no doubt, to bring it forward in favour of Louis.

His dwelling was invaded and forced, his cloſets and bureaus were broke open; numbers of his papers diſperſed and loſt; they were not put under the protection of the law; there was no ſeal put upon them; no inventory taken in the preſence of Louis. It was extremely eaſy in the tumult and violence of ſuch an act, that papers might be taken away or loſt, and particularly thoſe which would explain thoſe brought againſt him. In a word, Louis was not preſent when his papers were ſeized; he did not aſſiſt at the account taken of them, nor when they were examined; he has then the right to diſown them; nor can he be obligated to the contrary.

But farther, what is it theſe papers conſiſt of? They are the letters of a man who is no more. And can the letters of a dead man be brought here as proofs?

If the man to whom theſe letters are imputed ſtill exiſted, they could not conſtitute any evidence againſt him, unleſs he firſt acknowledged thoſe letters to be his own writing; how then can they be brought againſt a third perſon?

It is ſaid theſe letters ſpeak of *money diſperſed.* But if this circumſtance, which the letters themſelves do not explain, ſhould be true; if even the beneficence of Louis had been abuſed; if, under the

pretext

pretext of right intentions, he had been prevailed on to give certain ſums; is it not known with what arts kings are impoſed upon? How ſeldom do they know the real truth? Are they not always ſurrounded by ſnares? Is not their power or their riches always an object, and often turned againſt themſelves? And are they to be accuſed as corrupt, becauſe artful or importunate men take advantage of their munificence?

And next mentioned, is a memoir, addreſſed to Louis, in which Mirabeau is repreſented as diſpoſed to aſſiſt in bringing about a counter revolution in the provinces.

And can a king be anſwerable for all the memoirs preſented to him? Can he verify the contents, or prove the facts?

How much to be pitied would kings be, if they were thus to be charged with all the various things addreſſed to them, and made anſwerable for them.

Citizens, you know well that Mirabeau enjoyed the greateſt popularity during his life; and it even ſurvived him.

His memory is now attacked; but a voice is raiſed to defend it: Let us wait then till the nation has heard and pronounced upon it.

But, in reality, what do all theſe letters and papers offer againſt Louis? Not one circumſtance can be drawn from them which accuſes him: there does not even exiſt the ſhadow of proof that he approved of the plans preſented to him. The marginal notes ſeen on the memoirs only mention the date and the

name

name of the writer; nothing ariſes which can make known the ſentiments of Louis upon them; and ſurely, if it is permitted to cite the teſtimony of public opinion, his known character for ſtrict probity would be ſufficient to exculpate him from unfavourable concluſions.

With reſpect to the letter ſaid to be written by Louis to La Fayette in 1790, and where he aſks him to concert with Mirabeau. It appears that this letter was only projected, and never written to them. But ſuppoſing it had been, were not Mirabeau and La Fayette the two moſt popular men in France; they both ſupported the conſtitution and liberty; they both had at that time great influence over the minds of men:—and Louis aſked them to concert and act together—for what?—for *the good of the ſtate.* Theſe are the very expreſſions of the letters: where is then the crime?

You make an accuſation likewiſe of his letter to General Bouillé of the 4th of September in the ſame year.

But here Louis has no need of juſtification; he only followed the example of the Repreſentatives of the nation, who decreed, the 3d of September, that Bouillé was approved of, *for having glorioufly fulfilled his duty.* Louis wrote to him on the following day, to exhort him to continue in rendering the ſame ſervices to the nation: Is he then to be blamed for thinking and acting the ſame as the Repreſentatives of the nation did?

You aſk of him an account of the aſſembly at the Thuilleries the 28th February, 1789.

But this was not an act of Louis's; it proceeded from rumours and reports that had been ſpread; and ſome perſons, prompted by their great zeal, thought his perſon in danger, and collected together to defend him. Louis could not foreſee nor prevent their zeal, but he at leaſt haſtened to keep it within bounds; he made them himſelf lay down their arms they had brought with them, and was the firſt to remove their fears and apprehenſions for his ſafety.

You next impeach him for his journey to Varennes.

But as Louis at the time explained his motives to the Conſtitutional Aſſembly, I refer now to thoſe minutes.

You expected he ſhould give an account of the bloodſhed on the 19th of July at the Champ de Mars.

This, Citizens, is among the number of the accuſations which moſt oppreſſes him.

And is it poſſible you can accuſe him for the blood then ſhed! that it ſhould be laid to him! You have then forgot that at this period the unfortunate Louis was ſuſpended from his power; that he was ſhut up in his palace, and a priſoner, narrowly watched, and without any kind of intercourſe but with thoſe who guarded him: what means could he have in ſuch a ſtate of forming a conſpiracy?

Finally,

Finally, you accuſe him of having paid from the civil liſt, ſums for libels written to pervert the public opinion, and to ſupport the cauſe of the Emigrants.

I ſhall now ſoon arrive at thoſe articles which relate to the Emigrants, and ſhall have little trouble in convincing you, that Louis never had any views or intention of ſupporting, or even favouring their cauſe.

But, reſpecting the libels, I ſhall obſerve, that it was not with the miniſter of the department that theſe receipts were found, but with his ſecretary, who was not even known to Louis: and is there any anſwering for the abuſe which ſubalterns in office may make, or of their views and motives.

But farther, if Louis had even done this, not to pervert the minds of men, but to bring them back to him, it was doing no more than all the different factions, on their ſide, did to corrupt and miſlead. What reproaches then could be made him? The nation has now decreed themſelves a Republic; but it was not at that time the form of government which the public voice demanded; the Republicans were then but conſidered as a ſet of factious men; and they were ſtill ſo in the month of July laſt, when the Legiſlative Aſſembly all declared, by a decree, againſt this ſyſtem.

The nation wiſhed for the conſtitution; it was ſurely, then, no crime to write in defence of that conſtitution. Louis, as the head of the govern-

ment, as entruſted to maintain it, and by which he held his royalty, it was therefore his duty to watch over it; he might wiſh to influence the public opinion; and if, in thoſe views, and which he did for the beſt, he had been deceived or betrayed; that if, unknown to him, wrong principles were ſpread, or thoſe that were right attacked, we cannot accuſe him of what was done unknown to him, we can only bewail the deſtiny of kings! though not condemn them.

We have now, Citizens, gone through the firſt part of your accuſations. I have examined all the different articles ſeparately which you bring as a charge againſt Louis. I have, too, cleared him from thoſe charges; and ſtill there is one word remaining which I have not yet pronounced, and which alone would efface every error, obliterate every fault, if in reality he had committed any.—I have not ſaid that, after theſe things were done, Louis *accepted the conſtitution.*

Theſe words are alone ſufficient to anſwer all.

The conſtitution was a ſacred contract, the new alliance between the nation and the ſovereign.

This ſolemn alliance would never have been made without a great and mutual confidence.

There was then no longer the clouds of ſuſpicion and diſtruſt between the king and people. The paſt no longer exiſted, and it was no more remembered; every diſſention was appeaſed, every prejudice vaniſhed, every unfavourable idea was remo-

ved: and, therefore, every thing prior to his accepting the conſtitution ſhould not even be named.

We ſhall now enter upon thoſe facts which have followed that period.

Facts poſterior to the Acceptance of the Conſtitution.

I SHALL here divide the articles of accuſation under two different heads; thoſe which only affect the miniſters and agents which the conſtitution appointed under Louis; and, afterwards, thoſe which concern him perſonally.

It would, indeed, be extremely unjuſt to make Louis anſwerable for all the errors of his Miniſters, when the conſtitution did not exact it of him, but, on the contrary, made the Miniſters reſponſible to the nation: it was from them an account would be aſked, and upon them alone that the vengeance of the nation was to fall, if they were guilty of any act contrary to its laws. Theſe menaces were not addreſſed to the King; no penalty was pronounced on him for their crimes; becauſe, for that very reaſon, by making the Miniſters reſponſible for themſelves, they fettered the power of the King, and reduced it within thoſe very narrow limits. The King could do nothing of himſelf. An order ſigned by him alone, without his Miniſters, could not even be executed. The law, therefore, did not

expect any reſponſibility for Miniſters on the part of Louis.

It cannot, then, be juſt to accuſe both the Miniſters and Louis for the ſame things.

Nevertheleſs, in caſting an eye over the facts which are wholly miniſterial, mentioned in the liſt of charges, it is eaſy to ſee that thoſe are without foundation.

And of thoſe facts which come under the head of miniſterial reſponſibility, we firſt ſee that which reproaches Louis with not having informed the Convention of the treaty of Pilnitz, till after it was known to all Europe.

In the firſt place, the treaty of Pilnitz was a ſecret one, between the Emperor and the King of Pruſſia. The conditions of this treaty were but imperfectly known to Europe; no poſitive notice had been given of it to government, nor any certain proof even that there was ſuch a treaty; and the way it was at laſt known was from letters and notes of the agents placed at foreign courts; conſequently, there was no political reaſon that could make it a law for the executive power to give information of it, before it was well atteſted, to the Aſſembly, whoſe deliberations were always public.

But afterwards, this information, which government could not give to the Aſſembly while there were any doubts upon it, was communicated to the diplomatic committee as ſoon as notice was received

ved of it. For the truth of this, I appeal to the regiſters of the foreign affairs, which will ſhew the proof of this; and even farther, that when the firſt news was brought concerning this treaty being in agitation, before it was known that it would be concluded, the committee was immediately informed of it: of this I had the proof in my own hand; ſo that the Miniſter to whom this delay was imputed, and who cannot now exculpate himſelf, ſince he is now no more, was evidently not guilty in this point.

Louis is reproached too, that the commiſſaries ſent to Arles were employed rather in promoting a counter-revolution than in ſuppreſſing it.

Louis has himſelf anſwered this point in the examination he underwent. He told you, that it was not from the conduct of theſe commiſſaries they were to judge of the intentions of government, but from the inſtructions they had received.

You find no fault with the inſtructions given them, how then can you with government?

You charge Louis with having delayed a month ſending the decree relative to the re-union of Avignon and the Comptat Venaiſſin to France.

The ſame complaint was made, Citizens, to the Miniſter Leſſart: this was one of the great charges againſt him, and upon which the high national court was to have pronounced.

Leſſart is no more: he periſhed at the moment when he was preparing his juſtification; he declared himſelf that this juſtification, which he was prepa-

ring

ring in his priſon, would clearly teſtify his innocence. And can you to-day renew an accuſation againſt his memory, when his death prevented him the power of defending himſelf?

You next accuſe Louis of the troubles of Nimes, the diſturbance of Jales, and the conſpiracy of Duſaillant.

And is Louis then to be anſwerable for all the diſturbances and tumults which ſo great a revolution muſt neceſſarily have excited? It is impoſſible, generally ſpeaking, to avoid both public and private calamities in a country where the form of government is changed. In the ſouthern provinces of France it was particularly to be apprehended, where a natural vivacity and warmth of diſpoſition lead men to adopt eaſily the impreſſions of the moment.

Louis is accuſed with having favoured theſe commotions. It was thought, that becauſe the Princes, his brothers, had a correſpondence with Duſaillant, he had likewiſe; but this is a great error, as may be concluded by the papers communicated to Louis on that ſubject; among theſe may be remarked, a power given to Duſaillant, to borrow in the name of the Princes the ſum of a hundred thouſand crowns; now, we may imagine, if Louis had favoured this conſpiration, that they would not have been under the neceſſity of borrowing a ſum ſo diſproportioned to their wants, but have been more effectually aſſiſted by Louis.

And farther, as ſoon as government had knowledge of theſe troubles in the ſouth, the Aſſembly were immediately informed of it by Louis himſelf; and all thoſe meaſures which they wiſhed or ſuggeſted were taken to repreſs theſe tumults; and the conſequences are the proofs; for the ſteps taken by government very ſoon ſuppreſſed them.

Upon this, too, another reproach is made to Louis, of a letter which he received from Wiginſthein, commander in the ſouth, after he had been recalled from his command.

It is ſuggeſted, that Louis employed him after this time.

In the firſt place, Louis could not prevent Wiginſthein to write to him after his recal: but Louis, at the ſame time, declares, that he has not the leaſt recollection of having received the one mentioned, and which is only founded upon a pretended regiſter kept by that officer.

All that Louis could do, was, that he ſhould not be employed by him after that time; which was the caſe, as he never was.

A command was talked of at Corſica; but it was never given to him.

Another was ſpoken of in the north. It is poſſible, indeed, that La Fayette might have aſked it. The plan of a letter which was found at the war-office, ſeems to be an indication of it; but the fact is, that this letter was never ſent, and that Wiginſthein remained

remained ever after at Paris, without any employ, till his death.

Louis has been charged with the ſtatement given by Narbonne to the National Aſſembly relative to the army.

I reply, that upon the reſignation of his office, the National Aſſembly decreed, that Narbonne, ſolely reſponſible for all acts of government that concerned that department, carried with him the eſteem and the regret of the nation.

Louis has been charged with having deſtroyed the navy, and with having retained the Miniſter Bertrand, notwithſtanding the repreſentations of the National Aſſembly.

To this charge I anſwer, that the Miniſter Bertrand has himſelf ever refuted the reports raiſed to his prejudice; and that while the National Aſſembly did not accuſe him, Louis was at liberty to retain him in his confidence.

He has been charged with the diſturbances in the Colonies.

I think I need not juſtify him upon this head.

Louis has himſelf explained, in his examination, that he had denounced thoſe hoſtilities to the National Aſſembly the moment he had certain knowledge of them; the official papers of that department furniſh the proofs.

The ſurrender of Longwi and Verdun is laid to the charge of Louis.

With reſpect to Longwi, it was the inhabitants who gave it up; and as to Verdun, was it not Louis who named this commandant, now ſo celebrated for his heroiſm, this Beaurpaire, who preferred death to ſurrendering?

Louis is charged with having ſuffered the French nation to be inſulted in different courts of Europe.

Upon this I have only a few words to ſay.

I demand, in the name of Louis, that the Chargé des Affairs étranger be compelled to deliver up the papers, in which will be ſeen by the moſt authentic proofs, that whenever government was informed of any inſult done to the French nation, in what court of Europe ſoever, an immediate ſatisfaction was demanded.

Time is wanting to make theſe reſearches ourſelves; but Louis atteſts that the proofs ſtill exiſt.

Finally, Louis is charged with having retained the Swiſs Guards, in oppoſition to the conſtitution, which prohibited him, and to the National Aſſembly, who had commanded their departure.

The following ſtatement of facts will anſwer to, and refute this imputation.

A decree of the Conſtitutional Aſſembly, of the 17th of September, had ſet forth, that the King ſhould be prayed immediately to preſent to the legiſlative body a new formation of the ci-devant regiment of Swiſs Guards, according to the conventions and capitulations which ſhould have been accepted by the Helvetic corps.

In the mean while, the National Aſſembly, conſidering that the above-mentioned regiment had, from its conduct, merited the approbation of the nation, had ordered that it ſhould remain upon the ancient footing, till further was determined upon its deſtination, and upon the mode of its ſervice. In purſuance to this decree, the Swiſs Guards were retained upon the ſame eſtabliſhment.

The 15th of July laſt, the Legiſlative Aſſembly iſſued a decree, ordering, that the executive power ſhall cauſe the troops of the line that are in garriſon to leave Paris within three days.

Another decree, of the ſame day, orders, that the diplomatic committee ſhall report upon the capitulations with the Swiſs, and upon the ſuppreſſion of the charge of colonel-general of the Swiſs.

In the 17th letter of D'Affry, relative to the order which had been given for the departure of the regiment of the Swiſs Guards,

He refers to the capitulations, which were not yet annulled.

The decree which orders that proviſionally, and till the report of the diplomatic committee, two batalions of the above regiment ſhould withdraw thirty thouſand toiſes from the capital.

D'Affry, divided between the Helvetic capitulations, and the deſire which appeared to be manifeſted by the Aſſembly the 4th of Auguſt, addreſſed new obſervations to the Aſſembly upon the mode of executing the decree.

The

The Aſſembly paſſed to the order of the day.

The decree is executed.

Theſe, Citizens, are the concerns of Miniſters.

Louis might have diſpenſed with diſcuſſing them from the ſole reaſon that they were ſo.

If all theſe facts were founded, they would indeed furniſh matter for reproach; and it would be wrong in Louis not to reply to them.

But in diſcuſſing them with the rapidity to which I have been forced by ſhortneſs of time, I would prove to the people of France, that even in things for which the nation did not expect he ſhould account, Louis has always conducted himſelf as if he had been obliged by the law to anſwer for them.

I ſhall now paſs on to facts which may be conſidered as perſonally concerning him.

§ II. *Facts that perſonally concern Louis.*

Here, Legiſlatures, time ſtill urges me to proceed with rapidity.

I will, nevertheleſs, reply to all the accuſations brought againſt Louis.

I may indeed anſwer them with more haſte, and with leſs detail, than if I could have given myſelf up to all the minutiæ neceſſary for a defence which comprehends ſo many different heads: but ſtill I will anſwer the charges in ſuch a manner as to refute them.

I muſt again obſerve, the counſel of Louis has not thought of themſelves, they have only thought of Louis. We are ſenſible, that to ſupport a cauſe, upon which all Europe are looking with inquietude, and defending it before the Repreſentatives of a nation, which, by its triumphs, is become an object of aſtoniſhment to every other, offers to the mind of man a ſubject ſo rich and ample, that a diſcuſſion of it would have been needful equal to the ſubject itſelf: but we now wiſh to enlighten the people, bring them back, and ſurmount thoſe prejudices with which they have been inſpired: we would convince them by a ſimple detail of facts, and laying aſide the powers of oratory as a farther ſacrifice to Louis; which, under ſuch circumſtances, we ſhall no doubt be approved for.

Louis is firſt attacked upon his refuſing to ſanction the decree of the camp at Paris, and that of the prieſts.

I could, without doubt, obſerve, that the conſtitution leaves the king abſolutely at liberty in his ſanction; and that, ſuppoſing Louis to be miſtaken in the motives that induced him to refuſe to ſanction the decree of the camp at Paris, the nation could not have a right to demand the reaſons of his refuſal, and ſtill leſs to make it a crime againſt him.

But waving this reflection, and ſuppoſing it to be an error in judgement, I anſwer, that his refuſal originated from prudent motives; he feared to excite troubles; the decree was of a nature to give alarm

to

to the national guard; the opinions of the capital were divided; a great part of the people appeared to juſtify the decree, a ſtill greater part appeared to combat it; and the council itſelf was not unanimous. In the midſt of theſe agitations Louis thought it prudent to refuſe the ſanction they demanded; but at the ſame time he determined upon a meaſure which had the advantages, without the inconveniencies of the decree. He formed the camp of Soiſſons; and the event has proved that this combination has become the moſt important for the nation; for the camp of Soiſſons has rendered the greateſt ſervices to the French army; and, in fact, that of Paris would have been uſeleſs.

With reſpect to the decree of the prieſts, we cannot, Citizens, force conſcience; Louis would have wounded his in ſanctioning it; he might no doubt be miſtaken, but his error itſelf was virtuous; and in blaming the reſult, it is impoſſible not to reſpect the principle.

Call to mind the memorable day of the 20th of June, and ſee with what courage and firmneſs Louis maintained his opinions! How many princes had receded on the appearance of a danger ſo menacing! Louis, on the contrary, liſtened to the ſuggeſtions of conſcience rather than to fear: he continued firm to his reſolution; and if any thing is able to juſtify his refuſal in the eyes of thoſe who have been the moſt diſpoſed to charge him with it as a crime, I

dare believe it is his perſeverance in the refuſal itſelf.

Nor do not believe that the opinion of Louis upon the decree of the prieſts was entertained by himſelf only, and unſupported by any of his Miniſters: the Miniſter Mourgnes proteſts to him the ſame day, the 20th of June, that the *decree neither accorded with his principles nor his heart.*

A memoir is alſo brought againſt Louis on the cauſe of the prieſts, which had been conveyed to him from Rome, and in which it appeared that the Pope reclaimed his rights upon Avignon, &c.

But how could Louis have prevented the Pope from ſending him a memorial? And where can be the crime on his part for having received it?

A letter is alſo produced againſt him, which he wrote in 1791 to the Biſhop of Clermont, in which he expreſſes himſelf as diſpoſed to re-eſtabliſh the Catholic worſhip when he ſhould be able.

But this ſhould be conſidered as an opinion purely religious, and, in conſequence, a free opinion: this liberty of conſcience is written in the conſtitutional code; the civic conſtitution of the clergy, on the contrary, is not mentioned, it has been withdrawn, or, rather, it never made a part of it, and Louis wrote that letter previous to his accepting the conſtitution.

Louis may, beſides, have accepted the conſtitutional code without conſidering it exempt from errors:

rors: he even ſaid ſo when he accepted it. He might hope for legal reforms in it, but be far from entertaining the intention of deſtroying or overturning that conſtitution.

Louis is charged with having continued the pay of his guards, which the Aſſembly had ordered to be diſbanded.

Here, Citizens, many anſwers occur.

Firſt, we cannot conteſt that Louis had the power of refuſing to ſanction the decree which had been pronounced upon the diſbanding of his guard, ſince the conſtitution itſelf had licenſed that guard, and that it could not be taken away but by his conſent: however, the Aſſembly demanded the diſbanding, and he ordered it. But as the decree which ordered the *diſbanding* granted to Louis the power of re-creating that ſame guard, and of compoſing it again in part of the ſame ſubjects, it neceſſarily followed, that till the re-compoſition could be effected, Louis continued to them their pay as before; and it was at once both an act of humanity and juſtice; towards thoſe who might be again enliſted it was right ſo to do; and to the others, becauſe their fate was not then determined upon.

Beſides, he did not do this clandeſtinely; he did it by a public ordinance.

It is ſaid, that among theſe guards ſome were known to be diſaffected to the new conſtitution.

In the firſt place, they were not to be conſidered guilty before it was proved ſo.

2dly,

2dly, Thoſe who were convicted of diſaffection in the eyes of Louis would not have been again enliſted; but, till convicted, it would have been barbarity in Louis to have refuſed them the ſuccour which their neceſſities required.

Louis is alſo charged with having given ſuccours to the emigrants, and with carrying on a correſpondence with his brothers.

He is alſo charged with having, by means of his ambaſſadors, favoured the coalition of foreign powers againſt France.

In a word, he is charged with influencing the Court of Vienna.

Legiſlators, I join all theſe accuſations together, as they come under the ſame head. I will now anſwer them.

Firſt, I muſt obſerve, that in all the public acts of adminiſtration, Louis has conſtantly teſtified the ſtrongeſt oppoſition to the emigration, and has always oppoſed it, not only by all his national proclamations, but in all his negociations with foreign powers.

In ſupport of this, I appeal to the official papers of the department, and thoſe of the council; time is wanting to inveſtigate theſe ourſelves, but they contain a multitude of examples.

I ſhall only cite one remarkable fact, of which the public records furniſh the proof.

In the month of November 1791, the emigrants endeavoured to purchaſe cannon and other ammuni-

tion

tion from the inhabitants of Francfort, but were refuſed.

Louis is informed of it by his Reſident.

Immediately he writes, by his Miniſter, to the Reſident, giving him orders to thank the Magiſtrate of Francfort in his name for the right conduct he had obſerved on the occaſion, and to exhort him to redouble his vigilance, to prevent the emigrants procuring the arms and ammunition they demanded.

So much for public acts; and is there any private ones exiſting to contradict them?

We ſpeak next of pecuniary ſuccours.

Citizens, there has not been one ſingle emigrant, a true emigrant, to whom Louis has given pecuniary aſſiſtance.

He has contributed to the ſupport of his nephews from the time their father was incapable of providing for them; but who could have the courage to charge him with it as a crime?

In the firſt place, one of theſe nephews was only eleven years old, and the other fourteen, when their father left France; and can children of this age be conſidered as emigrants, in following their father?

In the ſecond place, no law which fixed the age relative to emigration at this time exiſted; the Convention was going to make one, but it did not then exiſt.

And, thirdly, from the time of the decree, which declared the property of emigrants to belong to the

nation, and which conſequently comprehended the eſtates of their father, the nephews of Louis were wholly deſtitute; and they were his nephews. Was he then forbad the feelings of nature? Was it neceſſary that, becauſe he was a king, he ſhould ceaſe to be a relation, or even to be a man?

He beſtowed ſome private donations on the governeſs of his children; but it was, on the governeſs of his children, and ſhe had left France from the year 1789.

He had beſtowed favours on Choiſeul Beaupré, one of thoſe who had the care of his youth; but Choiſeul had retired into Italy from the beginning of the Revolution, and had never borne arms againſt France.*

He has provided for Rochford, who likewiſe is mentioned in the act of accuſation; but Rochford is not an emigrant.

He cauſed a ſum of money to be conveyed to Bouillé; but this was for the journey of Montmedy.

He is charged with beſtowing a donation upon Hamilton; but juſtice obliged Louis to indemnify him for the expence he incurred in the above journey; an expence which his ſituation rendered him unable to ſupport.

* We have forgotten to ſpeak of La Vaugnion, who was under the ſame circumſtances as Beaupré, and he had returned into Spain from the beginning of the Revolution.

It is ſaid, that Bouillé remitted to Monſieur, by order of Louis, a ſum of ſix hundred ſome thouſand livres, which he received from him.

Could you believe it, Citizens? 'tis a phraſe merely ambiguous which has given riſe to this imputation; the order ſent by Bouillé ſays, *remitted to Monſieur, brother of the King, by his order.*

This order is evidently that of Monſieur, who gave orders in foreign countries, and even ſome warrants, under the King's name; the miſtake has ariſen from the quality of brother of the King, which is added to the name of Monſieur. The truth is, and Louis affirms it, that he never cauſed any pecuniary ſuccours to be ſent to Monſieur. Of this we ſhould have had authentic proofs, were the papers produced which accompanied the bill ſent to Bouillé, and in which muſt neceſſarily have been found the order of Monſieur. All that he has done has been to pay an old debt of his other brother, of 400,000 livres; but for this debt Louis had engaged;* and certainly it cannot be ſurpriſing that he ſhould not chuſe to forfeit the word he had given. His engaging for the library in 1789, and of which

* The treaſury was charged with the payment of ſeveral debts of Philip d'Artois. Savelette Delaage had advanced to one of the creditors a ſum of 400,000 livres, and Louis engaged for the payment. It is this engagement of which we ſpeak; thus the ſum in queſtion has been paid to a creditor in France, and, in conſequence, can have no concern with the emigration.

they do not heſitate to make a crime, ſince the moſt innocent actions are attributed to him as ſuch, was alſo an act of benevolence, which had for its object the favouring and ſuſtaining this commerce.

Thus all the liberalities with which he is charged does honour to his heart; and not one of them can, with juſtice, cauſe his principles to be ſuſpected.

He is charged with having uſed his influence in the Court of Vienna: and, to prove it, a letter is cited from Dumoutier to Monſieur; in it Dumoutier appears to repreſent Breteuil as having ſome influence in the Court of Vienna, and at the ſame time ſuppoſes that Breteuil might know the *will* of the king.

In the firſt place, it is but a letter of Dumoutier's, and Dumoutier was not the agent at foreign courts for Louis, but for the Princes. His opinion, therefore, cannot, in this inſtance, have any weight.

In the ſecond place, the opinion itſelf does not prove the exiſtence of the fact of which Dumoutier ſpeaks; that is to ſay, that *Breteuil knew the will of the King*.

And, finally, when we would even regard the aſſertion of Dumoutier as a proof of this ſtrange fact, where is the proof which ſhould neceſſarily follow, that this *will* of the king, which is not explained, was of a nature meriting accuſation?

A letter alſo is cited from Toulongeon, written at the time he was preparing to take a journey to Vienna. In it, it is pretended, he ſaid, that *the*

King

King had deigned to ſend him word that he approved of his conduct.

I ſhould firſt obſerve, that the authenticity of this letter appears infinitely ſuſpicious; for in it one Valery is ſpoken of as nephew to Toulongeon, and lieutenant colonel; whereas, we are aſſured that Valery is only *couſin* to Toulongeon, and not a lieutenant-colonel.

But, admitting the truth of the letter, ſuch as it is, what reſults from it?

Where, in reality, is the proof that Louis has approved the conduct of Toulongeon?

Can he be accuſed of an aſſertion to which he is a ſtranger?

And is not the falſity of this aſſertion in itſelf made ſufficiently clear, when we obſerve that it is to the Princes, the brothers of Louis, that Toulongeon has written that Louis ſent him word that he approved of his conduct, and that upon a fact ſo important, ſince it concerned the intentions or the will of Louis, he did not give theſe Princes any token or proof of the truth of his aſſertion.

Beſides, to what tends all theſe accuſations, the baſis of which is taken from letters? We may judge from a particular example.

A letter of Choiſeul Gouffier is brought againſt Louis, by which letter it appears that Choiſeul was buſied in cementing the alliance of Turkey with Auſtria: becauſe Choiſeul has been the ambaſſador

of Louis, it was thought that the projects of Choiſeul himſelf might be imputed to Louis.

But the letter of Choiſeul himſelf will anſwer to this imputation.

This letter proves two things; the firſt, that two months before his recal, Choiſeul Gouffier had offered his ſervices to the Princes, and had not received any anſwer.

The firſt begins thus:

" Although I have not received from your Royal " Highneſſes the orders I two months ago preſumed " to ſolicit, I hope you have deigned to receive " with goodneſs the tender of my devoted and unal- " terable fidelity."

And the ſecond is, that three days after his recal, and on account of his recal, Choiſeul Gouffier determined to renew the offer of his ſervices to the Princes, and to form projects againſt the ambaſſador of the nation which was named to replace him.

The proof is thus in the other letter:

" Three days ago I received my letters of recal; " they inform me that I am replaced by M. de Se- " monville. The projects of this national ambaſſa- " dor are not to be doubted;—and your Royal " Highneſſes are too clear-ſighted not to perceive " the fatal inconveniencies of the negociation with " which he is charged."

Thus it was Choiſeul Gouffier who wrote, who acted, who, recalled by Louis, offered his ſervices

to

to the Princes, who ſtrove to preſerve his place, in ſpight of his recal; and for which Louis is accuſed!

Finally, a note, without date, is produced againſt Louis, ſaid to be written by the hand of Monſieur, in the name of his two brothers, and aſſerted to be found among his papers.

Louis declares, that he can neither own nor diſpute the authenticity of this billet.

In the firſt place, this note is an act of his brothers, and not of his.

Secondly, the billet itſelf evidently proves that Louis held no correſpondence with them; for it neither ſuppoſes news received before, nor an anſwer expected afterwards.

Thirdly, the laſt ſentiment carries the date clearly to the epoch of the ſuſpenſion of Louis in 1791; the date alone, therefore, would be ſufficient to prevent any inference being drawn from it.

I will not dwell upon the charges of commerce and monopoly which are brought againſt Louis, and of which it is pretended, the papers of Septeuil furniſh the proof.

You have yourſelves done him juſtice; you have not made it an accuſation, but a queſtion; but when you put this queſtion to Louis, he no doubt manifeſted his aſtoniſhment.

The circumſtance which ſerved for the ground of this imputation, ſo revolting, is extremely ſimple.

Louis,

Louis, like all his predeceſſors, had a particular ſum of money which he appropriated to acts of benevolence.

In the year 1790 he conſigned it to Septeuil, even before he was treaſurer of the civil liſt.

Septeuil, who was unwilling to be ſuſpected of having perſonally profited by it, placed it firſt in bills upon Paris, and afterwards in letters of exchange upon Paris, and upon foreign ſecurities.

In the intervals he gave accounts to Louis, or paid the ſums for which Louis gave orders upon him.

Theſe are the facts; and Louis affirms that they are true: and among the papers of Septeuil there is nothing that can prove the contrary.

All that appears by theſe papers is, a ſpeculation which it ſeems Septeuil, who had conſiderable property, had made in the month of March laſt, on his own account, in merchandizes bought and ſold abroad.

But Septeuil, who, in a public declaration explains this ſpeculation, not only confeſſes that it regarded none but himſelf, but aſſerts, that there was a particular regiſter kept for the ſtock of Louis; they might alſo be found among his papers, which indicated the uſes to which it was put. Of this regiſter no account has been given.

I ſhall not dwell neither upon theſe pretended ſocieties of counter-revolutioniſts which Louis is ſuppoſed

poſed to have kept in Paris, and who were ſaid to be deſtined to ſtir up diſpoſitions agreeable to his views.

Never did Louis deſcend to ſuch acts?

Never, as he himſelf declared to you, had he a view to a counter revolution.

The Miniſters, it is true, might wiſh to know the ſtate of Paris.

They might have obſervers.

They might have recompenſed theſe uſeful agents; but this was the buſineſs of the Miniſters, and not of Louis; and beſides, the Miniſters themſelves could never have any views in theſe meaſures but what was wholly conſtitutional.

I come now to the charge of the ſubordination of ſeveral members of the Legiſlative Aſſembly.

Louis is accuſed of attempting, by corrupt means, to make the decree relative to the liquidation of the expences of his houſehold, and of the penſions of the civil liſt, paſs.

Legiſlators, I dare to tell you that you yourſelves did not believe it.

You did not believe there was a ſingle member of the Legiſlative Aſſembly capable of ſelling himſelf to the corruption, nor that Louis was capable of exacting it.

And in doing it, what had been the advantage to Louis?

The liquidation of the expences of his houſehold had been eſtimated in the Conſtitutional Aſſembly by Monteſquieu at thirty millions.

It had been eſtimated by Carnbon in the Legiſlative Aſſembly at the ſame ſum.

The adminiſtrator of the civil liſt inclined equally on his ſide to the ſame eſtimate. But he had in view another plan. He wiſhed that the officers of the King's houſehold, who ſhould be retained, ſhould depoſit in the national treaſury, under the form of engagement, of which the intereſt ſhould be paid from the civil liſt; by which means the liquidation was reduced to twenty.

This plan had been equally adopted by the commiſſioners of the liquidation.

It was alſo propoſed to have it accepted by the National Aſſembly.

And what was the great utility offered in this plan that corruption ſhould be employed to obtain it?

It reduced the liquidation ten millions.

It relieved the national bank of ten millions.

It charged the civil liſt with the intereſt of the ſum.

But where could be found the great advantages accruing to the finances of Louis?

A ſum of fifty thouſand livres, it is ſaid, was demanded by the commiſſioners of the liquidation; but this ſum was not deſtined to himſelf; it was to defray the expence of the office expences, which a liquidation ſo conſiderable exacted.

With regard to the liquidation of the penſions, it appears that the deſign of the decree was to divide theſe penſions into three claſſes.

The penſions for the ſervice of the military houſehold was ſubmitted to the liquidation..

All the penſions granted by the predeceſſors of Louis, for ſervice in the domeſtic houſehold, were equally ſubject to it.

And as for thoſe granted by Louis himſelf for his own houſehold, or by the late Queen, they left the incumbents chargeable to him on the civil liſt.

It is for this project of the decree, which diſencumbered, it is ſaid, the civil liſt of a large number of penſions which was upon it, that it is ſuppoſed corruption was employed; and to prove this corruption, a letter of the adminiſtrator of the civil liſt is produced, written, it is alſo ſaid, to Septeuil, and in which he tells him, that this decree would coſt fifteen hundred thouſand livres, and that he muſt have that ſum the next day.

I ſhould firſt aſk if this letter is authenticated, if it was in truth written by the adminiſtrator of the civil liſt, and if it was he who addreſſed it to Septeuil?

I could aſk, if, as at this time the member no longer exiſts, the evidence of a letter can be produced, the authenticity of which before his death he did not acknowledge; if a ſentence, which he could not, perhaps, himſelf have explained, had he ſtill lived, can be interpreted againſt his memory; if, in

a word, this can be made any proof that corruption was really employed?

I could aſk——But why conſiderations of this kind, when I can ſay, the fact is, that the papers communicated themſelves ſhew, that it was Louis alone who prevented the projected decree from being preſented to the National Aſſembly.*

Can it be ſuppoſed, if capable of adopting wrong meaſures to obtain this decree, that he would have prevented its being executed?

And what could poſſibly have been his motives to have obtained by intrigues ſuch a decree?

I ſhall not ſpeak of his well-known character, which recoils at any baſe or diſhonourable meaſure;

Nor of the members of this Aſſembly, who were certainly incapable of acquieſcing in it.

I only aſk, what could have been his intereſt in ſo doing?

If, in truth, he had wiſhed to free himſelf from the penſions thrown upon the civil liſt, what prevented him? He had it in his power to refuſe payment of them.

Louis would certainly have preferred this meaſure to the other. He would rather have exerciſed an act in his power, than have had recourſe to thoſe which were in their nature dangerous. The man who is capable of a baſeneſs that may be injurious to himſelf, is ſtill more ſo of making a refuſal,

* The papers themſelves mention circumſtances which prove that Louis was not pleaſed at the meaſure.

though

though an unjuſt one, which cannot prove injurious to him.

In a word, I can conceive that ſort of corruption which turns to the intereſt of the perſon (as unfortunately the human heart gives every day the proof;) but I cannot account for that which only covers the offender with ignominy, whilſt the advantages ariſing are wholly for others.

Another accuſation againſt Louis is, and which at firſt excited great ferment among the people, not without reaſon, was his continuing to keep in pay his garde-du-corps at Coblentz.

This, Legiſlators, I muſt confeſs to you, was a painful conſideration to me, and I cannot help ſaying, that before I entered upon this defence, I was ſo unjuſt as to ſuſpect the ſincerity of Louis upon this ſubject; but the proofs appear ſo very clear, and the inferences to be drawn ſo very ſtriking, that after examining all things, my former opinions vaniſhed; and, enlightened by the defence of Louis, I make this ſolemn and public reparation, which I owe him, and ſenſibly acknowledge my former error.

A few words will be ſufficient to clear this accuſation.

Every one here preſent muſt remember that the different papers relative to this buſineſs that were publiſhed, the letter and memoire of the Prince de Poix to Louis, the letters from Coblentz, and others,

were

were all as far back, and refer to the month of October 1791.

And the Miniſter in the civil liſt department writes to the Treaſurer of that department, in November 1791, upon this matter, as follows:

" Sir,

" The intention of the King to the officers, and " four companies of his garde-du-corps, is, that " their preſent pay ſhould be continued, until he de- " termines and makes known what their final fate is " to be; but his Majeſty's farther intentions are, " that the regiment ſhould not receive their pay as " befoer, but that every officer and man ſhould be " ſeparately paid at the office from the civil liſt, " upon his receipt, accompanied with a certificate, " teſtifying that they are at that time reſident in the " kingdom.

" His Majeſty likewiſe orders me to inform you, " that the ſame treatment is to be obſerved with the " officers and others in the regiments heretofore the " gardes de Françoiſes.

" But his Majeſty's farther orders are, that all " payment relative to expences whatever for the " companies of the garde-du-corp, ceaſes from the " 1ſt of July laſt, except what is above-mentioned, " and ſubſiſtence for horſes."

This is conviction which needs no comment. It removes the very ſhadow of guilt, though Louis has been made the unfortunate victim of theſe aſſertions,

Nevertheleſs,

Nevertheleſs, to what an obſervation does this not lead. Every paper which could wear the appearance of accuſation againſt Louis were all made public, and he was denounced as guilty to all France, and to all Europe, and this letter, which diſcovers the truth, which alone is the fulleſt juſtification, was kept back, and remained unknown.

And farther, when the papers of the Miniſter belonging to the civil liſt were ſeized, the original order given by Louis, as tranſmitted to Septeuil, ſhould certainly have been among thoſe papers; it was the authority by which he was impowered to act, and as ſuch would not, we may ſuppoſe, fail to preſerve it; nevertheleſs, every paper, except this order, was found.

Happily for Louis, he remembered the very date of this letter, and his deſiring the comptroller of the civil liſt to write it to Septeuil; he had the letter ſearched for in his bureaus, and an exact copy taken, and which he can produce this day to the whole world.

It is eaſy to form an opinion, Citizens, by the nature of this charge of that of others.

Judge, then, what advantages Louis would have poſſeſſed over his accuſers, if his papers had not been ſeized and taken away as they were; if he had been preſent himſelf when they were examined, he could have referred to ſuch as would refute thoſe produced againſt him; and would have brought to his aſſiſ-

tance

tance all that his memory at this period cannot poſſibly ſupply him with.

With what powers could he then have anſwered to all theſe accuſations you bring againſt him, and which indeed he has anſwered, even without having thoſe teſtimonies to refer to! what ſatisfactory proof would he not have been able to preſent! what light would he not have thrown on theſe myſterious charges, which indeed only preſerve an appearance of conſiſtency from the very darkneſs which covers them!

Think, too, how great our regret muſt be, we who are his defenders, to be deprived of theſe means which would have furniſhed ſuch powerful conviction! And what muſt be our feelings, that under all theſe great diſadvantages, time even fails to avail ourſelves of thoſe in our power! In ſuch a cauſe as this, not to be able to make the neceſſary reſearches, anſwerable as we now ſtand, in ſome degree, to all Europe for the fate of Louis, to know that it is the importance alone of this ſacred taſk which forms the obſtacles to fulfil it, and in which our very zeal may prove a misfortune!

We preſent to your minds, Citizens, our well-founded regrets, and in making known to you the affliction which oppreſſes me, I arrive at laſt to the fatal day of the 10th of Auguſt, which would indeed conſtitute the greateſt of crimes on the part of Louis, were it true that he had thoſe criminal intentions which are by ſome imputed to him.

We

We entreat you, Citizens, on our part, not to conſider us in this moment merely as the defenders of Louis. We have our own conſcience, our honour. We form likewiſe a part of that people whom you repreſent. We think we feel as they do; and our wiſhes are theirs. We are citizens, and Frenchmen, and lament with them the calamities of that day; all the blood then ſhed; and, believe us, if we had thought Louis the guilty inſtrument of theſe dark events, you would not this day ſee us before you at the bar pleading his cauſe, and lending him, if I may ſo expreſs it, the ſupport of our integrity and efforts.

But Louis is accuſed; and, accuſed of crimes like theſe, muſt he not defend, not juſtify himſelf to you, and the whole world? He muſt then be heard, and, in hearing him, remember you have conſtituted yourſelves his judges; lay aſide, then, your opinions, your prejudices, your animoſities; you muſt liſten to him as if you were ſtrangers to that ſcene of deſolation and horror, which I muſt with regret bring again before you in deſcription. Legiſlators, ſince that day, a day which you have yourſelves called immortal. Your ſucceſſes have been ſuch as to render you generous, but I now only aſk of you to be juſt.

You recal the day of the 20th of June, and the refuſal which Louis made to the armed multitude who forced his palace, and in which refuſal he continued to perſevere, and which rendered the multitude more

violent: every advantage was taken of this; they were encouraged, and ſtill farther ſuggeſtions inſpired to them. A rumour was ſpread of plots being formed, of a party being prepared, who intended taking away the King, to convey him out of Paris; this party was repreſented as having great reſources, of preparations made, of arms depoſited; denunciations were then made to all the municipal bodies; the ferment increaſed from day to day, and the month of July paſſed in a way which announced too clearly the gathering ſtorm.

Meanwhile, Louis was employed to calm, if poſſible, the minds of men. He at firſt thought it better and moſt prudent to let theſe ſuſpicions wear away; but when he found they did not, that the report of preparation, and a ſecret depoſit of arms, gained ground, he ſaw it would be wrong not to refute them, and was ſenſible that it became neceſſary to convince the people of their error, and in conſequence deſired that his palace might be ſearched. He wrote on the 20th of July to the Mayor, to beg that he would come himſelf for that purpoſe. The Mayor replied, that he would commiſſion the municipal officers to make the viſit. This viſit was not made. Louis then writes to the National Aſſembly, to impart to them his uneaſineſs, and acquaint them with the Mayor's anſwer. The Aſſembly remain inactive.

In this interval the tumults increaſe, from the very precaution taken by Louis to prevent them; the

rumours

rumours are renewed, the minds of men became every day more enflamed, and nothing but the fall of Louis was heard, and at length called for; the commiſſioners of the ſections meet; an addreſs is preſented to the National Aſſembly the 3d of Auguſt by theſe commiſſioners, headed by the Mayor, to demand that the Repreſentatives of the nation ſhould yield to the wiſhes of the people, and dethrone Louis: they at laſt, by repeated demands, obtain this conſent: the day is fixed when it is declared it ſhall be pronounced; and they add, that if it is not in the ſitting from the 9th to the 10th of Auguſt, that the tocſin ſhould be heard at midnight, and an inſurrection of the people follow.

From the beginning of Auguſt Louis began to ſee all the danger to which he was expoſed; he found the agitations and opinions which prevailed againſt him, and was informed every day of the increaſing tumults; and, fearing the errors of an inflamed multitude, he ſaw that his palace would be no longer an aſylum to himſelf and family, he then, and then only, began to adopt meaſures for his defence; he placed the national guards round the Thuilleries, and the Swiſs in the interior of the palace, and kept up a continual intercourſe with the popular authorities; in a word, he neglected no meaſures which prudence and the imminent dangers to which he was expoſed ought to ſuggeſt.

The 9th of Auguſt arrives, and the fears of Louis are verified, and become ſtill more alarming; he is

informed of the aſſembling of the people, and the preparation ſaid to be making, perhaps for that very night. The unhappy monarch then redoubles his precautions: he augments the number of the guards in and about the palace; calls to his aſſiſtance the different conſtituted powers, all the municipal officers, and the department of Paris; and with theſe ſuccours, aided by the preſence of the magiſtrates, who poſſeſs moſt influence over the minds of the people, he waits the iſſue. The magiſtrates then order, in the name of the law, that the national and Swiſs guards ſhould not ſuffer the multitude to force the palace; and the Mayor himſelf viſits the different poſts.

The foretold tocſin was ſoon heard to ſound, the alarm beats, and the multitude aſſembles. Some hours paſs in a general agitation without any effects; but towards morning the people under arms began their march towards the Thuilleries, followed by pieces of cannon, which they placed againſt the gates of the palace.

The Procureur-general of the department then came forward, accompanied by the municipal officers, ſpeak to the people, and repreſent to them, that, aſſembled in ſuch numbers, they can neither petition Louis nor the Aſſembly, and entreat that they will name twenty deputies for that purpoſe: this, however, has no effect.

During this time the numbers augment, and an immenſe crowd proceed to the *Place du Carouſel*, and

and there movements then become more formidable; the danger every moment increaſes; the magiſtrates, informed, preſent themſelves before the troops, and the Procureur-general reads the 5th article of the law of the 3d of October; he enjoins the guards to defend the habitation of Louis, as the law ordains, and then gives, with regret no doubt, the order to oppoſe force to force—the only reply he receives is a diſcharge of cannon.

The Procureur-general then re-enters the palace, and informs Louis of his danger, and how little ſuccours he has to expect. Louis had ſent to the National Aſſembly his Miniſters ſome hours before, to beg that they would ſend to his aſſiſtance a deputation: he then repeats his ſolicitations, and acquaints them of the extremity of his ſituation. The Aſſembly take no ſteps, and determine nothing.

The Procureur-general, then, with two other members of the department, entreat Louis to repair to the National Aſſembly, and with his family to take refuge there, as the only place of ſafety. Louis is prevailed upon to do ſo.

In an hour after our misfortunes began.

Citizens, theſe are the facts, ſuch as they are known to be, ſuch as they are noted in all the public records, in thoſe of the National Aſſembly, and every other.

I have added nothing to them myſelf; I have only done my duty to the cauſe I am defending, to recal theſe melancholy details; and you may perceive,

perceive, by the rapid manner in which I have gone over them, how painful the office has been to me. But ſuch is the truth.

And now, Legiſlators, forget, if it is poſſible, the ſad effects of this fatal day, and with me ſeek only the cauſes, and ſay what part of them is it you can impute to Louis; where does his guilt lie? Is it in what followed his retreat to the National Aſſembly, or in what preceded that retreat?

It cannot be his conduct after that period, for ſince that moment, you know, Louis has neither ſeen, or heard, or done any thing; and this aſylum, which he voluntary made choice of, he left but to enter the priſon which has ſince detained him.

How the combat began, few can tell; it is unknown to me, and will be equally ſo, perhaps, to the hiſtorian of future times, who may retrace it; but certain it is, that Louis can never anſwer to them.

If his guilt is to be found in his conduct previous to his retreating to the National Aſſembly, in what does it conſiſt? What do you accuſe him of?

You talk of hoſtile intentions on the part of Louis.

But where is the proof of theſe intentions? What are the facts you can produce, or the acts committed by him?

It was the rumour of the moment that a plot was laid to carry off the King.

But where are the indications, the proofs of this really being the caſe? Where are to be found the traces of ſuch a plot?

You accuſe him of making preparations.

It is true, I ſee, Louis made preparations to defend himſelf; but where were the preparations for attacking? How can you prove him the aggreſſor? Was it he who made the firſt ſtep? Who was guilty of the firſt act?

You reproach him for having at that time Swiſs guards about him.

But I find, in the journals of the National Aſſembly of the 4th of Auguſt, that a member propoſed to the following effect: that at the ſame time he did juſtice to the Swiſs by every teſtimony in their favour, that they ſhould be taken from the King as his guard. Other members again propoſed to reward the ſervice of the Swiſs, and declare that they had merited well of the country; but that it ſhould be decreed, that thoſe who remained at Paris could not do duty as the King's guard but upon an order from the conſtituted authorities.

Neither of theſe propoſals, however, were adopted.

Louis remained, then, under the ſanction of the decree of the 15th of September, which ordains, that, until the capitulations were renewed, the Swiſs might remain as before, and continue the ſame ſervice.

It was, then, allowable for Louis, to have Swiſs guards.

He is accuſed for having reviewed theſe troops in the morning. You may as well accuſe the Mayor too, for having viſited himſelf the different poſts.

Louis acted throughout with the authority of the law: he had the right to defend his dwelling, and was even anſwerable to the law for doing it; how then can he be accuſed for having taken only the neceſſary precautions for that purpoſe?

It is even made a crime in him to have ſtationed troops round the palace.

He was then to have made no reſiſtance to an armed multitude, but have ſubmitted to their violence? Would that have been defending the power he held from the conſtitution? Was he not a branch of that conſtitution, and which the law expreſſes ſhould be protected?

Conſider it, Citizens, as your own caſe for a momoment. If you were told an armed and miſguided multitude was now marching towards you, and that, notwithſtanding your ſacred characters as legiſlators, they were coming to drag you from this ſanctuary, how ſhould you act?

To thoſe who accuſe Louis as the aggreſſor, a few words only will be neceſſary.

Is he the aggreſſor, let me aſk, who is forced to defend himſelf, who is the firſt to call in the protection and aſſiſtance of the municipality, and all lawful authorities, and who goes even ſo far as to call upon the National Aſſembly itſelf, whoſe preſence at the Thuilleries would moſt likely have prevented the calamities which followed?

Can it be ſaid that he wiſhes the misfortunes of the people, who only oppoſes to them their own defenders?

But

But why talk more upon this charge? why let this ſtigma dwell any longer with Louis?

Who is really ignorant here that the events of the 10th of Auguſt were long before prepared, and ſecretly nouriſhed? that an inſurrection againſt Louis was deemed a neceſſary meaſure? and that this inſurrection had its agents, its promoters, its office and direction? Who does not know that plans were combined, and treaties ſigned and concluded upon? that all was propoſed, all arranged for the execution of the great deſign which was to bring France to the point ſhe is now arrived at.

Theſe are facts, Legiſlators, which are not to be diſavowed; they are public, and all France re-echoes with them; they paſſed here among you; on this very ſpot where I now ſpeak has been diſputed the glory of the 10th of Auguſt. I am not going to conteſt that glory with thoſe who wiſh to reap it; nor do I attack the motives of the inſurrection; I only ſay, that, ſince theſe things are known and acknowledged, it is clearly impoſſible that Louis ſhould be the aggreſſor.

And yet you accuſe him! You accuſe him of the blood that was ſhed; and that now, you ſay, cries for vengeance againſt him.

Againſt him who, at this very time, came and confided himſelf in the midſt of you, as a means to prevent it!

Againſt him who, when a King, was never known to iſſue a ſanguinary command! who, on the 6th of

October, forbid his own guards from even defending themſelves.

Againſt him, who preferred returning a captive from Varennes, rather than cauſe the death of one ſingle man!

Againſt him, who, on the 20th of June, refuſed every aſſiſtance that was proffered him, and remained alone in the midſt of an enraged people!

To impute to him the blood ſhed—Ah! he bewails as much as you can the fatal cataſtrophe which coſt the lives of ſo many! How deeply the recollection of that day affects him! it is, indeed, his greateſt affliction. He knows well he was not the author of thoſe direful events: but could he ſuppoſe he was even the involuntary cauſe of them, it is what he could never conſole himſelf for.

And is this the man you accuſe!

Frenchmen, where, then, is now thoſe qualities which once diſtinguiſhed, where is now that national character for greatneſs and loyalty!

Would you ſhew your powers in overwhelming with misfortunes the man who had the noble reſolution to repoſe ſuch confidence in you?

Have you no more reſpect for the ſacred duties of hoſpitality?

Is no commiſeration due to ſuch unparalleled misfortunes?

Do you not think that a King, who ceaſes to be one, is not a victim ſufficiently ſtriking, without its being

being neceſſary to add ſuch accumulated miſeries to his fate?

Frenchmen, this revolution, which regenerates you, developes great qualities; but fear, leſt it ſhould at the ſame time efface humanity from your heart; without which every other virtue is loſt.

And now liſten to what future ages will record.

Louis XVI. at the age of twenty years aſcended the throne, and at that early period of life gave the example of every moral and religious virtue; he had no guilty weakneſs, no diſgraceful paſſions; he was juſt, frugal, diſintereſted, and ever the trueſt *friend of the people*. When they made known to him their oppreſſions, he relieved them by removing thoſe taxes which moſt aggrieved them. They aſk the abolition of ſervitude, and he was the firſt to give the example of it throughout his own dominions. When ſolicited to reform the laws, and ſoften the rigour of puniſhment, he did it. The people wiſhed to ſee that numerous claſs of citizens, who were deprived of their lawful rights, reſtored to them; this he granted by new laws which he ordained, and others which he repealed, for that effect. They aſked for liberty, and he gave * it them.

* The word *gave*, pronounced at the bar by the counſel in the defence, was afterwards eraſed by him in his manuſcript; but the National Convention ordered it ſhould be again inſerted.

We had eraſed this expreſſion from reſpect to the Conven-

 tion,

them. He even prevented their wiſhes by his own voluntary ſacrifices. And yet it is in the name of this people he is now accuſed, that they aſk——But I ſtop here, Citizens, I leave the concluſion to be made hereafter. And remember, your judgement will be recorded in the annals of every nation, and as ſuch be tranſmitted to poſterity.

(Signed) LOUIS.

DE SEZE, LAMOIGNON, MALHERBES, TRONCHET.

After the Defence was cloſed by the Counſel, Louis addreſſed the Convention with the utmoſt compoſure and firmneſs, as follows:

" My defence is now before you. I ſhall not re-
" peat it; but in addreſſing you for the laſt time,
" perhaps, I declare to you, that my conſcience does
" not reproach me; nor have thoſe who defended
" me ſaid any thing but the truth. I never feared
" having my conduct publicly examined; but my

tion, and becauſe it excited murmurs in the tribune; but becoming a ſubject of debate in the Convention, we think it right to declare, that by the word *gave*, we had no other meaning, than to recal that Louis had prepared the liberty of France, by the convoking of the States General; and, indeed, the decree of the nation itſelf, upon the 4th of Auguſt 1789, when it proclaimed Louis "*The Reſtorer of French Liberty*," might alone have ſuggeſted it to us.

Note of the Counſel.

" heart

" heart is deeply wounded to find among the charges
" brought againſt me, that of wiſhing to ſhed the
" blood of the people; and, above all, that the ca-
" lamities of the 10th of Auguſt ſhould be imputed
" to me.

" I confeſs, I thought the repeated teſtimonies I
" have at all times given of my affection for the
" people, as well as the whole tenour of my con-
" duct, would have been ſufficient proofs that I ne-
" ver heſitated expoſing myſelf for them, and have
" ſpared me theſe imputations."

THE concluſion to this melancholy tranſaction has too ſoon followed. It might, indeed, have been added at the moment of the defence, and the mere form of trial ſpared to the victim, long before devoted. And yet, prepared as the world was for the ſequel, it came at laſt as if unlooked for, as if the atrocity of the act was too great even for a Philip Egalité and his agents to execute, though they had decreed it. They have, indeed, by this laſt act, filled up the meaſure of their iniquities, and ſtamped a tenfold guilt on every former crime. Such is the unparalleled and aggravated iniquity attending every circumſtance of this cataſtrophe, that to dwell upon them would be only diſtreſſing the feelings of our nature, and recal the painful ſenſations ſo recently

experienced upon the melancholy occaſion by a loyal and generous people, by, we may add, this nation at large. We would rather wiſh, as was elegantly and juſtly expreſſed by a great character, "for the "honour of humanity, to draw a veil over this foul "event, and blot from the hiſtory of mankind the "whole of this horrid tranſaction; but the breath "of tradition will hand it down to the wonder and "indignation of poſterity, to remain a ſtain upon "the human race as long as time ſhall endure."

Let us, however, remember, this atrocious deed is not to be imputed to the French nation, it is the work only of a guilty few, of a faction, whoſe crimes have led them to power, and which crimes alone can maintain. Religion, laws, juſtice, and humanity, every ſacred tie by which mankind are bound, they have trampled upon, and the ſtandard of deſpotiſm, blood, and rapine, under the name of liberty, is raiſed upon the ruins of their deſolated and wretched country; a country till now flouriſhing, powerful, and happy. Under the dagger of theſe aſſaſſins the virtuous and unfortunate Louis fell, whilſt his faithful ſubjects, the reſpectable, but oppreſſed and exiled part of the French nation, could only lament in ſilence the fate of their beneficent and lawful king. But a day of retribution may come, and that life they could not ſave they may revenge, when an avenging hand may cruſh theſe monſters of an uſurped power, by which France is now deſolated; whoſe aim is equal deſtruction to every nation around

around them; to ſubvert every government, by ſowing the ſeeds of anarchy and rebellion among the people; and, in fine, ſhould their reign be of much or longer continuance, baniſh peace and virtue from the face of the earth.

But an offended and omnipotent Being will at laſt make them the ſignal objects of his wrath, even in this world! May he lend his divine protection, and aſſiſt the powers of Europe now united againſt them, but particularly this country; and that a war, upon which the ſafety, and, perhaps, the preſervation of Europe depends, may have a ſpeedy and happy iſſue! May its ſucceſſes bring ſome relief to the exiled and oppreſſed ſubjects of France, the victims of their loyalty and integrity. Their ſufferings for three years paſt have entitled them to the ſympathy of every generous mind; and the aſylum which we have afforded lately to the perſecuted and diſtreſſed part, does the higheſt honour to this country, and will deſcend to future times among its moſt noble acts. Famed as this nation has ever been for liberality and humanity, the protectors of the oppreſſed, as they have ever been the dread of their enemies, the people of England never appeared greater than in this moment, when the general voice proclaims their loyalty and attachment to their ſovereign and his government, convinced of the wiſdom and excellence of their conſtitution, and happy in the proſperity of their country. What a ſtriking contraſt does England now preſent

to the ſcenes of horror, deſolation, and anarchy, and every ſpecies of wretchedneſs, of which France is the ſad example!

In cloſing theſe reflections, let us, at the ſame time, lament the deſtiny of that numerous and ſuffering part of the French nation, who have been the victims of the moſt guilty and deſperate faction that ever diſgraced the annals of mankind! the many thouſands, oppreſſed ſubjects of France, who are groaning under the preſent tyrannic and hateful power; and the loyal and noble emigrants will ever be entitled to the ſympathy of every liberal mind, but particularly at this moment, overwhelmed as they are by the fate of the moſt *unfortunate of Monarchs!* He now, indeed, is above their reach, reaping the juſt reward of his virtues: and if a knowledge of this life is permitted to the departed, ſtill does the beneficent heart of Louis XVI. drop a tear for the ſufferings of his afflicted and oppreſſed ſubjects. Who more than himſelf ever gave the example of fortitude and ſenſibility? Good in his proſperity, great in his misfortunes!

Impreſſed as we have ever been with theſe ſentiments, from a knowledge of his virtues, we join the general ſigh for his unmerited fate. Greatly, indeed, does the whole conduct of Louis the Sixteenth, throughout the cloſing ſcene of his life, ſtamp his character, an honour to human nature, as a king, a man, and a Chriſtian. Theſe virtues are ſo affectingly ſhewn in the will of his late Majeſty, that we

can

can but ſubjoin it, though already known to the public. It will deſcend to poſterity, when theſe ſad events are recorded as the laſt, though not the leaſt proof of the fortitude, reſignation, and true piety of Louis the Sixteenth.

WILL OF LOUIS XVI.

" In the name of the Holy Trinity, the Father, " the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, this 25th " day of December 1792.

" Louis XVI. by the name of King of France, " being for more than four months ſhut up in the " Tower of the Temple of Paris, by thoſe who were " formerly my ſubjects, and being deprived of all " communications with my family from the 1ſt in- " ſtant; moreover, involved in a proceſs, the iſſue " of which, from the nature of human paſſions, it is " impoſſible to foreſee, and for which there is no pre- " tence nor juſtification in any exiſting law, having " only God as witneſs to my thoughts, and to whom " I can addreſs myſelf.

" I hereby declare, in his preſence, my laſt wiſhes " and ſentiments.

" I leave my ſoul to God my Creator. I entreat " him in mercy to receive it, and not to judge it ac- " cording to its deſerts, but according to thoſe of

" our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who offered himſelf up a
" ſacrifice to God his Father for us men, however
" hardened we might be. I die in union with our
" holy mother the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman
" Church, which holds its powers in uninterrupted
" ſucceſſion from St. Peter, to whom Chriſt entruſted
" them; and I confeſs every thing contained in the
" ſymbol and commandments of God in the church,
" the ſacraments and myſteries, as now and ever
" taught by the Catholic Church. I have never
" pretended to judge upon the different modes of
" interpreting the dogmas which agitate the church
" of Chriſt; but I have always ſupported, and al-
" ways ſhall ſupport, ſhould God grant me life, the
" deciſions which the eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors, united
" with the Holy Catholic Church, have given, or
" may give, conformably to the diſcipline of the
" Church as followed ſince Jeſus Chriſt. I pity
" with all my heart our brethren who may be in
" error; but I preſume not to judge them, nor do I
" love them leſs in Chriſt, agreeable to the inſtruc-
" tions of Chriſtian charity. I pray to the Almighty
" that he will pardon all my ſins, and which I have
" endeavoured ſcrupulouſly to recollect: I deteſt
" and humiliate myſelf in his preſence. Deprived
" of the aſſiſtance of a Catholic prieſt, I entreat my
" Creator to accept the confeſſion which I have
" made to him, and particularly my profound re-
" pentance for having ſigned my name, although
" ſtrongly againſt my will, to inſtruments which

" may

" may be contrary to the faith and diſcipline of the " Catholic Church, to which I have ever continued " in my heart ſincerely attached: and I beg of God " to receive my firm reſolution, ſhould he grant me " life, to avail myſelf, as ſoon as I can, of the miniſ- " try of a Catholic prieſt, to confeſs all my ſins, and " to receive the ſacrament of repentance.

" I entreat all thoſe whom I may unknowingly " have offended, (for knowingly I never committed " an offence againſt any one) or to thoſe to whom " I may have ſet a bad and improper example, to " pardon the evil they conceive I have done them.

" I entreat all thoſe who have charity to unite " their prayers with mine, to obtain pardon of God " for my ſins.

" I forgive with all my heart all thoſe who have " become my enemies without cauſe, and I entreat " God will forgive them, as well as thoſe who, from " falſe or miſguided zeal, have done me injury.

" I recommend to God my wife and my children, " my ſiſter, my aunt, my brothers, and all thoſe who " are connected with me by the ties of blood, or " otherwiſe.

" I moreover particularly implore the Almighty " to caſt an eye of mercy upon my wife, my chil- " dren, and my ſiſter, who have ſo long ſuffered " with me, to ſupport them with his grace, ſhould I " be deſtroyed, and as long as they remain in this " periſhable world.

" I recommend my children to my wife. Her " maternal tenderneſs to them I never doubted; but " I particularly entreat her to make them good " Chriſtians and honeſt; not to ſuffer them to re- " gard the grandeur of this world, ſhould they be " condemned to experience them, only as periſhable " poſſeſſions, and to turn their regard only towards " ſolid and eternal glory. I entreat my ſiſter to have " the goodneſs to continue her kindneſs to my chil- " dren, and to fulfil the duties of their mother, ſhould " ſhe be taken from them. I entreat my wife to " forgive me all the evils ſhe may have ſuffered on " my acount, and the reaſons of diſſatisfaction I " may have occaſioned her during the courſe of our " union, as ſhe may be ſure I retain no reproachful " ſentiment againſt her.

" I recommend ſtrongly to my children, after what " they owe to God, who ought in all things to preſide, " to remain always united among each other; to be " ſubmiſſive and obedient to their mother, and " gratefully ſenſible of all the care and trouble ſhe " has had on their account, and that they will do ſo " in remembrance of me.

" I recommend to my ſon, ſhould he ever have " the misfortune to be king, to conſider, that he " ought to ſacrifice every thing to the happineſs of " his fellow citizens; that he ought to forget all " animoſities and reſentments, and particularly thoſe " which relate to the misfortunes and diſappoint-

" ments

" ments which I have experienced; that he cannot
" procure the happineſs of his people but by reign-
" ing according to the laws; yet, at the ſame time,
" that a king cannot make himſelf reſpected, nor
" effect the good purpoſes of his heart, but in pro-
" portion as he poſſeſſes the neceſſary authority; he
" is otherwiſe confined in his operations, and, being
" no longer reſpected, he is more detrimental than
" uſeful.

" I recommend to my ſon, as far as his circum-
" ſtances will permit, all thoſe perſons who were at-
" tached to me, and to conſider as a ſacred debt
" contracted by me towards the children and rela-
" tions of all who periſhed in my behalf, and thoſe
" alſo who are rendered miſerable on my account. I
" know there are perſons who were attached to me,
" that have not conducted themſelves as they ought,
" and who have been ungrateful; but I pardon them.
" (In moments of diſorder, the imagination is heated,
" and we are ſometimes not maſters of ourſelves.) I
" requeſt my ſon will only conſider their diſtreſs.

" And I wiſh it were in my power to prove here
" my grateful acknowledgements to thoſe who have
" teſtified towards me a ſincere and diſintereſted at-
" tachment. If, on one hand, I have been deeply
" afflicted at the ingratitude and diſloyalty of thoſe
" whom I have conſtantly diſtinguiſhed by favours;
" I have, on the other hand, had the conſolation
" to experience the attachment and voluntary exer-

" tions in my favour. I entreat them to accept
" my warmeſt acknowledgements.

" In the preſent ſtate of affairs, I ſhould be fear-
" ful of involving my friends in embarraſſments
" were I to ſpeak more explicitly; but I moſt ear-
" neſtly enjoin my ſon to embrace every opportunity
" of finding them out.

" I ſhould think I did violence to the ſentiments
" of the nation, if I did not openly recommend
" to my ſon Meſſrs. de Chamily and Hue, whoſe
" ſincere attachment to me induced them to ſhut
" themſelves up with me in this abode of ſadneſs,
" and who expected to fall victims to their attach-
" ment. I alſo recommend Cleri, for whoſe at-
" tentions I have had every reaſon to applaud
" ſince he has been with me. As he has con-
" tinued with me to the laſt, I entreat the Gen-
" tlemen of the Commons to give him my
" cloaths, books, watch, my purſe, and other little
" articles which were depoſited with the Council of
" the Commons.

" I pardon ſincerely thoſe who guarded me the ill-
" uſage and reſtraint which they thought it their duty
" to adopt towards me. I have found ſome tender
" and compaſſionate friends; may they enjoy that
" inward peace and tranquillity, which their way
" of thinking always beſtows.

" I requeſt Meſſrs. de Malherbes, Tronchet, and
" de Seze, to receive my warmeſt acknowledge-

" ments

" ments and gratitude for the care and anxieties
" that they have ſuſtained on my account.

" I conclude, by declaring before God and at the
" eve of approaching Him, that I reproach no one
" with the crimes they have committed againſt me.

" Given at the Tower of the Temple, the
" 25th December 1792.

(Signed) " LOUIS."

Written by BEAUDRAIS, Municipal Officer.

FINIS.

LITERARY ASSEMBLY,
OLD BOND STREET.

Under the Patronage of their Royal Highneſſes,
THE PRINCE OF WALES,
DUKE OF YORK,
DUKE OF CLARENCE,
DUKE OF GLOUCESTER,
HIS HIGHNESS PRINCE WILLIAM FREDERIC,
AND MANY OF THE PRINCIPAL NOBILITY AND GENTRY.

HOOKHAM,

WHOSE moſt ſtrenuous exertions have been uniformly and unremittedly directed to promote the intereſt of ſociety, and the encouragement and diſſemination of Literature, has, at a very great expence, fitted up an elegant ſuite of apartments for the eſtabliſhment of a

LITERARY ASSEMBLY,

which he daily furniſhes with the various Publications of this and every foreign country, on all ſubjects; and including all the Periodical and Diurnal Productions of repute to be met with on the Continent, in Great Britain and Ireland, the Eaſt and Weſt Indies, as well as the Foreign Gazettes.

His plan having received, independent of particular patronage, the ſanction of the public approbation, and his very reſpectable Liſt of Subſcribers already convincing him that he was not too ſanguine when he projected it, he now intends to ſolicit the more immediate attention of MEN of LETTERS and TRAVELLERS. It is to ſuch he looks for its ſupport, and from ſuch he hopes for that information which will tend to its perfection. Whatever improvement they may pleaſe to ſuggeſt ſhall be thankfully adopted.

It is his higheſt ambition to render his Literary Aſſembly a center of general communication, where perſons of curioſity may find the beſt company, the beſt books, the beſt intelligence, with the beſt accommodations. He is confident, that when the ſcale and aim of his Plan are fully known, it will be found beneficial to the community at large, and extremely convenient to all who have occaſion to conſult a Library, or who wiſh to have the occurrences of the day, as it is the moſt extenſive inſtitution of the kind ever attempted; and as he, though at an age when men moſt claim the privilege of retreating from buſineſs, will not conſider it as complete till it furniſhes every poſſible aid to Literature, and is deemed as much an honour to his country, as his

CIRCULATING LIBRARY,

now for thirty years eſtabliſhed, has been a benefit to it.—The Subſcription to the LITERARY ASSEMBLY will be TWO GUINEAS per ann. which, he is convinced, will not be thought extravagant, conſidering the immenſe number of publications daily iſſuing from the preſs.

As it is his wiſh to have the Company as ſelect as poſſible, none but Subſcribers can be admitted, nor any perſon as a Subſcriber, unleſs introduced by a Member, or known to *Hookham*; but as many reſpectable Foreigners, whoſe reſidence may not exceed *three* months, may wiſh, during that time, to ſee the Gazettes of their reſpective countries, they alſo will be admitted, for that period, by the introduction of a Member, on paying *One* Guinea.

The Rooms are opened at TEN in the Morning, every Day, Sunday excepted, and ſhut at the ſame hour in the Evening.

*** No Book, Pamphlet, or Newſpaper, can be allowed to be taken out of the room.